DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 109 24 **HE 001 487**

AUTHOR	Deegan, W. L.; And Others
TITLE	Joint Participation in Decision Making: A Study of Faculty Government and Faculty-Administrative Consultation at Fresno State College.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
BUREAU NO	BR-5-0248
PUB DATE	Mar 70
GRANT	OEG-6-10-106
NOTE	119p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.05
DESCRIPTORS	*Administration, Administrative Problems, *Decision Making, *Faculty Organizations, *Governance, *Higher Education, Participation
IDENTIFIERS	*Fresno State College California

ABSTRACT

This is one of a group of studies on faculty organization and faculty government. Fresno State College was studied for (1) the nature and effectiveness of the procedures that had been devised for faculty-administrative consultation, (2) the process of faculty and administrative participation in governance through the Academic Senate and selected Senate and college-wide committees, and (3) fundamental issues in faculty government and faculty participation in institutional decision making. The data were obtained from analysis of documents and interviews with 93 faculty members and administrators is imperative, and that arbitrary administrative action is unacceptable. The most pressing problem the College faces is that of turning a society divided by factionalization into an academic democratically governed community. At present, participants in the Senate and college-wide committees are polarized and politicized. (NF)

BC-5-0248
PA-24
OEIBR
HE

ED038109

JOINT PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING · *Deegan* · *McConnell* · *Mortimer* · *Stull* · CRDHE

HE001 487

Joint Participation in Decision Making

WILLIAM L. DEEGAN
T. R. McCONNELL
KENNETH P. MORTIMER
HARRIET STULL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education is engaged in research designed to assist individuals and organizations responsible for American higher education to improve the quality, efficiency, and availability of education beyond the high school. In the pursuit of these objectives, the Center conducts studies which: 1) use the theories and methodologies of the behavioral sciences; 2) seek to discover and to disseminate new perspectives on educational issues and new solutions to educational problems; 3) seek to add substantially to the descriptive and analytical literature on colleges and universities; 4) contribute to the systematic knowledge of several of the behavioral sciences, notably psychology, sociology, economics, and political science; and 5) provide models of research and development activities for colleges and universities planning and pursuing their own programs in institutional research.

The research reported herein was supported by Grant No. OE-6-10-106, Project No. 5-0248-2-3, with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, under the provision of the Cooperative Research Program. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Report Series

ED 038109

JOINT PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

A Study of Faculty Government and Faculty-Administrative Consultation at Fresno State College

William L. Deegan
T. R. McConnell
Kenneth P. Mortimer
Harriet Stull

1970

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California, Berkeley

Acknowledgements

The survey team wishes to express its appreciation for the generous cooperation of all members of the College who were interviewed or who supplied documents, statistical data, or other information. The ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of College Reorganization and its chairman, Dean Kenneth H. Beesley, were most helpful in orienting the survey group, listing problems which might be studied, and suggesting persons who should be interviewed. Final decisions on these matters, however, were made by the survey team. The Secretary of the Academic Senate supplied copies of minutes and other documents, and was helpful on many other occasions. The Office of Institutional Studies collated the basic data for the study of faculty participation in major Senate and College committees. Mrs. Sally Slocum, Secretary to Dean Beesley, scheduled the interviews. Mrs. Helen Barr and Mrs. Carolyn Robinson of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education took responsibility for the typing of the manuscript.

Financial support for the study was given by Fresno State College and the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

This report was submitted to the ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of College Reorganization, and reported orally at a special faculty meeting in May, 1969. In September, 1969, the ad hoc Committee transmitted the Report to the Executive Committee of the Fresno Academic Senate with the request that the Committee forward it to the Senate for review. The ad hoc Committee on Evaluation of College Reorganization also proposed that the Senate should assign the several specific recommendations of the Report to "committees, groups, or individuals for study, review and report to the Senate."

The ad hoc Committee also recommended that the "preliminary progress report to the Senate should be filed by the committee or group of prime responsibility by the end of the Fall semester (1969), with a tentative date of April 15, 1970, for filing of the final report.

The ad hoc Committee also asked that the Senate refer the Report to the Student Senate for review and recommendations, as well as to the President and his designees.

BR5-0248
PA24
OE/BR

Contents

Acknowledgments v

I. Introduction 1

II. Faculty Organization and Governance 6
- The Academic Assembly and Academic Senate 6
- Executive Committee 8
- Committee on Committees (CC) 15
- Academic Policy and Planning Committee (AP and P) 18
- Personnel Committee 24
- Board on Rank and Promotion (BORAP) 31
- Budget Committee 34
- Composition of Major Committees 44

III. Joint Participation in Decision Making 51
- The Authority Structure 53
- Educational Leadership 57
- Centralization and Decentralization in Decision Making 65
- Consultative Procedures 74
- Polarization 86

IV. Summary 96

Appendix 100

References 113

I

Introduction

ORIGIN OF THE STUDY

When the Faculty Council of Fresno State College adopted the report of the Committee on Academic Reorganization of the College (1965), it resolved that the reorganization should be evaluated after a three-year period. On April 29, 1968, the Executive Committee appointed an ad hoc committee to arrange for an appraisal. Dean Kenneth H. Beesley served as chairman.

Learning that the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, was engaged in a study of faculty government, Dean Beesley asked Dr. T. R. McConnell, director of the Center's study, whether Fresno State College might be included. At that time the Center had planned to make intensive studies at three large, complex universities--the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Illinois, and the University of Minnesota.

On July 26 Dr. McConnell met with the members of the ad hoc committee who were available to explain the nature of the Center's project and to learn from them what the proposed Fresno study might include. Early in the fall the ad hoc committee addressed an inquiry to Fresno State faculty members, asking first whether they believed that an evaluation should be conducted, and second, what the major phases of the investigation should include. Members of the Center staff reviewed the suggestions of the ad hoc committee and the faculty, and decided tentatively that some, but not all, of the problems proposed could be studied within the time available, that the Fresno study would be broadly relevant to the Center's interest, and that the Center's research program could be adapted so that it would be relevant to some, but not all, phases of faculty government at the college. The staff of the Berkeley project also concluded that what might be learned at Fresno could make a significant contribution to the broad problems of governance in higher education.

A Center group composed of Dr. McConnell, Dr. Harriet Stull, Associate Professor of Sociology at Stanislaus State College, and Messrs. Kenneth Mortimer and William Deegan of the Berkeley Center visited Fresno State on October 21 and 22, and interviewed 18 members of the faculty and administration to determine in detail what problems or issues might be investigated.

After an analysis of these interviews, the Berkeley group decided that in its broad investigation it would be willing to include the college in place of the University of Illinois. Subsequently, the ad hoc committee approved the inclusion of the college in the Center's project.

Topics Studied

It was generally agreed at the October 21 session of the ad hoc committee that the Fresno phase of the study would emphasize: (1) the nature and effectiveness of the procedures that had been devised for faculty-administrative consultation, (2) the processes of faculty and administrative participation in governance through the Academic Senate and selected major Senate and college-wide committees, and (3) fundamental issues identified in the studies of consultation and joint participation in decision making.

Plan of the Investigation

Against the background of discussions with the ad hoc committee and the preliminary interviews of October 21 and 22, the survey team devised three schedules to serve as general guides for interviewing faculty members and administrators. Copies of these schedules may be obtained from the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education. The choice of persons to be interviewed was discussed at a meeting of the ad hoc committee on November 25. At that time the committee made suggestions as to which Senate and college committees might be included, the number of members of these committees who might be interviewed, other members of the faculty who might be interviewed, the administrators who should be included, and the schools which should be involved through interviews or study of documents. Most of these suggestions were followed, although, for various reasons, not all of the persons suggested were interviewed. In the end, 75 interviews were conducted with faculty members and administrators in addition to the 18 interviews which were held in October.

It should be noted that after the list of interviewees was first made, the survey team announced that it would talk to any additional faculty members, administrators, or students who requested an interview. Two staff members and one student volunteered.

The final list of persons interviewed included the President, the Academic Vice President, the Executive Vice President, the Chief Budget Officer, the Executive Dean, the Dean of Graduate Studies, and the Deans of all seven schools. In addition, one or more members of the following committees were interviewed: the Executive Committee, the Committee on Committees, the Committee on Consultative Procedures, the Academic Policy and Planning Committee, the Personnel Committee, the Board on Rank and Promotion, and the Budget Committee. The survey staff also interviewed 16 additional faculty members in order to sample the widest possible range of views on matters being investigated.

School committee members interviewed included a limited number of members of such bodies as the Academic Council, the Personnel Committee, BORAP, and the Budget Committee.

The interview sample was not strictly representative of the faculty as a whole or of the complete roster of college and school committees. However, the survey team believes that through the relatively large number of interviews conducted it became acquainted with the range of attitudes and issues concerning faculty governance held by members of the faculty and the administration.

The research staff did not submit a questionnaire to a systematic sample of the faculty. Therefore, the survey group is not able to say how many members of the faculty took this or that position on matters at issue. But, this was not the objective; the purpose of the investigation was to identify the major problems which the college itself should resolve through established, or perhaps more effectively organized, processes of faculty-administrative consultation. This the survey team believes it succeeded in doing.

Limitations. In addition to those noted above, there were additional restrictions to the scope of the investigation. The study addressed itself to the internal governance of the college. Therefore, the report includes only incidental references to the State college system--its Trustees, its central administration or its Academic Senate. Neither does the report refer, except incidentally, to the relationship of the college or the state college system to the State Department of Finance, or to other agencies of the state government. This is not to say that the relationship of the college to the state college system or to the state government is unimportant; on the contrary, these relationships have decided effects on the development of the college. But the survey team simply did not have the time, the staff, or the resources to make a systematic study of these external influences. The study also excluded the relationship of the college to its community--either its immediate environment or the region where it is located. Again, this is not to suggest that these relationships are unimportant. This is a subject for further investigation by the college or by a research agency. Likewise, the survey team did not investigate the influence of external faculty organizations on faculty and college governance. The team contents itself with the observation that, as time goes on, these external bodies may profoundly affect the character and the atmosphere of the College, as well as its internal governance.

Organization of the Report. Part II discusses the composition, the functions, the operations, and the interrelationships of Senate and college committees. Part III is concerned with such general problems as joint participation of faculty and administration in decision making; the role of educational leadership; the processes of formal consultation and informal communication in conducting the affairs of the college, with emphasis on consultative procedures as an example of faculty-administrative relationships; centralization and decentralization in decision making; and faculty polarization.

II

Faculty Organization and Governance

This part of the report is mainly concerned with the basic structure for the internal governance of the college. The principal topics discussed are: (1) the participation of administrators in the Academic Assembly and the Academic Senate, and in selected Senate and college-wide committees; (2) the structure and functions of these committees; and (3) faculty participation in the Academic Senate and in selected Senate and college-wide committees.

The report treats the faculty structure and the organization of the School committees only as they relate to Senate and college committees.

THE ACADEMIC ASSEMBLY AND ACADEMIC SENATE

The survey team has concluded that the composition of the Academic Assembly and the Academic Senate is currently satisfactory; the method of representation is essentially sound.

The composition of both the Academic Assembly and the Academic Senate sets the stage, so to speak, for joint faculty-administrative participation in decision making. The Constitution of the Assembly provides that the academic and executive administrators shall be members of that body. The Constitution also provides that the President and the two Vice Presidents of the college shall be ex officio members of the Academic Senate. Furthermore, although there are no members of the central administrative staff on the four

Senate committees, administrative officers are ex officio members of all major college-wide committees.

The presence of administrative officers in the Assembly, the Senate, and the major college committees permits two-way consultation between faculty members and administrators at all stages in the development of institution-wide policy. This relationship is consistent with the basic premise of the consultative procedures which have been devised to govern the relationship between administrators and faculty. That premise, according to the Faculty Handbook (August 1968), states: "The ultimate purpose of consultative procedures shall be to guarantee full participation by faculty and academic administrators in the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the administrative and academic environment /p. 7/." The survey team believes that such joint participation in decision making is the only sound basis for internal college governance.

Deliberative Functions

The survey team concluded that the Senate and college-wide committee structure is basically sound. However, the team recommends a change in the composition of the Committee on Committees to simplify the constitutional requirement that the Academic Senate shall appoint members of college committees in consultation with the President of the college (Constitution of the Academic Assembly, Article II, Section 6, A).

There are many obstacles to the effective performance of deliberative bodies. One is size. The Fresno Academic Senate is relatively large, but not too large to deliberate and legislate effectively. Another obstacle is the obstruction of rational discussion by the membership itself. This takes the form of the substitution of personal attack for substantive debate. Still another obstacle to the vitality of the faculty Senate is its failure to hold its own committees accountable by requiring them to report directly and fully to their parent body, and by exercising substantive review of their recommendations.

The survey team recommends that the Executive Committee should restore the Senate's prerogative of substantive review of reports and recommendations of both Senate and college committees. The team believes that only in this way can the Senate become an effective deliberative and policy-making body, and it is convinced that the Senate should perform this function.

Student Participation

The survey team has not studied the participation of students in policy formation and decision making at the college. However, it wishes to commend the administration and faculty for including students in the membership of certain major college committees. There is every reason to believe that students can make a significant contribution to the educational policy and program and to the entire life of the institution. Fortunately, Fresno State is well on the way to fruitful collaboration among all the elements of the college community.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Of the eleven Executive Committee members, four are specified in the Constitution of the Academic Assembly: The President of the college, the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, and the Secretary of the Academic Senate. Of the seven remaining members, one must be chosen from among the state-wide Academic Senators. The other six members are elected from the Academic Senate for terms coinciding with their terms as Senators. The officers of the Executive Committee are the officers of the Academic Senate, who are elected by the Senate for one-year terms. The President attends the meetings regularly and participates fully in the discussions of the Committee,but refrains from voting on matters on which he will eventually have to rule.

The survey team interviewed seven of the eleven members of the Executive Committee for 1968-69, and fourteen of the total of twenty-one people who have served on the Committee since 1966. The interviews revealed that elections to the Executive Committee reflect the informal political composition of the Senate. The interviewees stated that two major groups compete in elections to the Committee and that the majority succeeded in denying the minority any representation on the Committee for 1968-69. In previous years the minority had succeeded in winning a seat on the Committee. The present monopoly was defended by its supporters as more efficient and less time-consuming than a divided Committee. However, the survey team's analysis of the Executive Committee minutes for 1967-68, and for 1968-69 up to February 24, 1969, revealed that meetings were as long and were held as frequently whether or not minority views were represented on the Committee.

It was also said that minority views are well known to Committee members and do not need to be represented on the Committee itself. These respondents said that because the Committee's meetings are open to all members of the college staff, except when the Committee goes into one of its infrequent executive sessions, divergent views can be, and are, expressed in the meetings.

The team interviewed approximately ten faculty members who either identified themselves as members of the minority or were so identified by others. These respondents argued that the minority is large enough to justify representation on the Committee. They also argued that such representation would enhance faculty morale and encourage minority participation in college-wide decision making.

Certain respondents complained that the atmosphere of the Committee's open meetings is not always conducive to free and full discussion. They declared that pressure groups often attend Committee sessions and that debate sometimes becomes personal and even acrimonious. Critics of the Committee asserted that they have not been permitted to debate issues fully, and that the Committee has not been receptive to suggestions from the floor. These criticisms are relevant not only to the matter of the Committee's composition but also to its constitutional and extra-constitutional functions.

Formal Duties

The Executive Committee's duties are specified in the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Article XI, Section 1, A, as follows:

1. The Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for the Academic Senate meetings.
2. The Executive Committee shall prepare the agenda for Academic Assembly meetings.
3. The Executive Committee shall receive all communications addressed to the Academic Assembly or the Academic Senate, and shall receive reports from college-wide and Senate committees.
4. The Executive Committee may act for the Academic Senate under existing Senate policies when the Senate is not in session.
5. The Executive Committee may act on matters not covered by Senate policy providing it purports to speak only for itself.
6. The Executive Committee shall appoint a parliamentarian for meetings of the Academic Assembly, Academic Senate, and Executive Committee.

Informal Activities

A major source of concern among some faculty members was the question of the Executive Committee's authority to change the reports of standing College and Senate committees. An analysis of Executive Committee minutes and interviews with members of the Executive and other committees revealed that four types of action have been taken by the Executive Committee after receiving college-wide or Senate committee reports.

First, the Executive Committee on occasion has forwarded reports unchanged either to the Academic Senate or to the President for action. As far as the survey team is able to determine, the Executive Committee, under accepted college policies and appeal procedures, determines whether a matter will be referred directly to the President or to the Academic Senate. In practice, such matters as Senate resolutions, Bylaw changes, nominations of committee members, and major policy questions are sent to the Academic Senate. For example, during the fall of 1968 the Executive Committee referred such matters as the following to the Academic Senate: Class scheduling; changes concerning the Budget, Election, Rules, and Research Committees; resolutions on librarians' salaries; the San Francisco State College crisis; college relations with investigative bureaus; and a general education program.

The Executive Committee referred directly to the President such matters as the following: A policy statement on "Solicitation, Acceptance and Acknowledgement of Gifts;" a report of the Academic Policy and Planning (AP and P) Committee on admissions policy; recommendations on the Educational Opportunity Program; the abolition of Dead Week; the establishment of Black Studies and La Raza chairs; and a policy statement of the Committee on Committees.

A second course of action which the Executive Committee has frequently followed is to refer reports back to the committees of origin for further action. For example, the AP and P Committee sent a report on admissions and registration to the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee referred the report back to AP and P with instructions to consult with a Dean and a faculty member, both of whom had objected to the report. One week later the Executive Committee accepted AP and P's revised report and forwarded it to the President for approval.

The recommendation of the Student Affairs Committee on relocation of the free speech area was also referred back to committee with instructions to consult with the Campus Planning and College Union Committees. The revised report was passed by the Executive Committee one week later.

It should be noted that the chairmen of committees whose reports are being considered are usually in attendance at Executive Committee meetings. After discussion with members of the Executive Committee, the chairman of a reporting committee may accept changes in the report on behalf of his committee.

Third, the Executive Committee may refer the report of one standing committee to another committee for further consideration. The recommendation of the AP and P Committee on a nepotism policy for the college was referred to the Personnel Committee for a recommendation. This type of action does not occur as frequently as either of the two procedures described above.

A fourth course of action is for the Executive Committee to change a committee report and forward it without formally referring it back to the original committee. In at least one instance the AP and P Committee requested that its recommendation not be changed by the Executive Committee. This occurred with the recommendation of January 6, 1969, on "Organizational Structure for Special Programs." A more controversial case involved the roster of committees for 1968-69 submitted by the Committee on Committees.

Authority

The foregoing analysis of the Executive Committee actions raises an important question: Does the Committee have the formal authority to change the reports of the other committees which are submitted to it? The answer should be found in the provisions of the Constitution of the Academic Assembly and the By-laws of the Academic Senate setting forth the formal authority of the Executive Committee.

There is some ambiguity in these documents as to whether the recommendations of Senate and college committees become the policy of the Academic Senate within 20 instructional days after submission to the Executive Committee, as stated in the Constitution of the Academic Assembly (Article II, Section 6), or after submission to the Academic Senate, as stated in the

Bylaws of the Academic Senate (Article XI, Section 1, B, D, E and F). It is clear, however, that the Executive Committee has not been specifically delegated the authority to change the reports of either college or Senate committees. The Assembly has delegated many of its powers to the Senate, but the Senate has delegated to the Executive Committee the authority to act under existing policies only when the Senate is not in session. The survey team has concluded that the Executive Committee has no authority to change committee recommendations, but rather must transmit them unchanged to the Senate or the President or to both. It may issue dissenting recommendations in a manner appropriate to the *Faculty Handbook's* definition of "recommendations /pp. 9-10/." (This report discusses the *Handbook*'s definition in Part III.)

Conclusions

The survey team reached the following conclusions:

1. Elections to the Executive Committee are along "political" lines. In 1968-69 the minority failed to win a voice on the Committee. The survey team believes that it is unwise for the Committee to be composed entirely of one of the two major factions in the faculty. Such a monopoly may eventually lead to severe morale problems. Moreover, the team believes that, in the long run, the vitality and legitimacy of faculty government depend on open access by all individuals and all parties to decision-making bodies.
2. The Executive Committee is an important vehicle for contact between the President and the faculty. Debate occurs here before positions are solidified. The President refrains from voting on matters on which he will have to rule.
3. The open meetings of the Committee are well attended and occasionally involve heated

discussions, which may hamper rather than encourage the free exchange of views and systematic analyses of issues.

4. According to the Constitution of the Academic Assembly and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, the Executive Committee is only a coordinating body, except when the Senate is not in session. In practice, however, it has taken unto itself certain powers not explicitly conferred on it, notably the substantive review and alteration of committee reports.

Recommendations

1. The survey team recommends that the powers of the Executive Committee be limited, as the Constitution and Bylaws provide, to those of an agenda and coordinating agency. The Executive Committee should transmit all Senate and college-wide committee reports directly to the Academic Senate and/or the President of the college without change.

   Although the Executive Committee has provided a useful means of contact between the faculty and the President and a forum in which the latter might share in important decisions, administrative-faculty relationships and an appropriate administrative voice can be maintained through other Senate and college committees.
2. The survey team regards the expediting function of the Executive Committee as an important one. It suggests that the Chairman regularly convene meetings of the chairmen of major committees for the purpose of expediting committee activities and providing liaison between committees prior to presentation of their reports to the Academic Senate.
3. The Executive Committee should develop a consent calendar for regular meetings of

the Academic Senate. This device will allow the Senate to dispose of routine matters quickly and to concentrate on more important questions. An objection from the floor of the Senate should suffice to remove an item from the consent calendar and place it on the regular agenda.

4. The Executive Committee now has the power to act under existing Senate policies when the Senate is not in session or cannot be quickly convened. The survey team believes it should retain that power.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

The Committee on Committees has seven members, who are nominated from the membership of the Academic Senate by the Executive Committee and confirmed by the Senate. In the past many faculty members have served concurrently on both the Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees. In the fall of 1968, four of the seven committee members were also on the Executive Committee. This has been changed so that there is currently only one person who serves on both committees.

Functions

The Committee on Committees, after consultation with the Executive Committee, is responsible for making nominations for committee appointments to the Academic Senate no later than May 15 of each year. The Committee also nominates members to committees when vacancies occur. (Bylaws of the Academic Senate, Article XI, Section 3). The Committee on Committees sends out a questionnaire seeking volunteers for service on committees. Of 600 inquiries mailed, the Committee received about 450 responses for 1968-69. The respondents were asked to rank the committees in order of their preference. The Committee on Committees also uses the Fresno State College General Catalogue and personal contacts with department chairmen as sources of names for committee service.

Relationships with the Executive Committee

The Committee on Committees submits its nominations simultaneously to the Executive Committee and the President. On receipt of the nominations, the Executive Committee puts them on its own agenda, usually for consideration one week later. This presumably gives the Committee time to study the list. At the appropriate meeting of the Executive Committee, the nominations are discussed in executive session. At this point any changes suggested by either the Executive Committee or the President are considered. While no changes have been made by either party during the current academic year, in the spring of 1968 the Executive Committee changed the nomination list submitted by the Committee on Committees before forwarding the list to the Senate and without notifying the Committee on Committees of the changes. (These facts were derived from interviews with members of both the Executive Committee and the Committee on Committees, as well as from the Minutes of the Academic Senate.) At the Senate meeting on June 4, 1968, a member requested a ruling on the authority of the Executive Committee to change the nominations of the Committee on Committees. The Rules Committee subsequently determined that

> The Committee on Committees reports its recommendations directly to the Academic Senate, not through the Executive Committee, but that at some point prior to this time it will consult with both the President and the Executive Committee. Neither the President nor the Executive Committee can make changes in these recommendations although they may ask the Senate to reject the recommendation [Executive Committee Minutes, November 11, 1968, p. 6].

The Executive Committee recommended that this ruling be accepted by the President, but the Minutes bear no indication of his action. The survey team finds the determination by the Rules Committee to be consistent with the team's own analysis of the formal consultative procedures and its analysis of Executive Committee activities. However, the team believes that the requirement of consultation with the President should be observed and that notifying him of the nominations before they are submitted to the Senate is not synonymous with consultation.

Role of the President in Committee Nominations. The team observes that the ruling that the Committee on Committees will consult with both the President and the Executive Committee prior to submitting its nominations to the Academic Senate means that it is incumbent on the Committee on Committees truly to consult and not merely to inform. Later in this report, the survey team proposes a definition of consultation which involves full and free two-way discussions between administrators and faculty bodies. In order to assure more adequate and meaningful consultation between the President and the Committee, the team recommends changes in the membership of the Committee and in the method of its selection.

1. The Committee on Committees should be composed of seven members, five of whom should be elected by the Senate from its membership, and one of whom should be appointed by the President. The seventh member of the Committee should be the President, or his representative, ex officio. The survey team believes that it is necessary for the Committee on Committees to have representation from all major groups on the campus. This balance is most likely to be achieved if at least one member is appointed rather than elected. It is recommended that the appointment not be made until after the election, and that the primary purpose

should be to balance the Committee so that it includes representatives of minorities which may not win elections.

2. The survey team recommends that the President or his designate serve as an ex officio member, so that the Committee may have access to an important source of information about prospective Committee members. As a member of the Committee, the President would also have an opportunity to discuss nominations confidentially. This recommendation reflects the team's belief that the faculty members and the President should consult one another prior to the time committee assignments become final. It should be emphasized that, as an ex officio member of the Committee, the President would not have the power to veto Committee nominations--his voice would be only one of seven. The Committee's nominations would still have to be arrived at by democratic committee processes and eventually ratified by the entire Senate. The recommended arrangement would have the advantage of satisfying the constitutional requirement of prior consultation with the President in the appointment of committees.
3. Finally, the survey team sees no reason to consult the Executive Committee about nominations after the Committee on Committees becomes an elected body. It therefore recommends that legislation be introduced to remove that requirement from the consultative procedures.

ACADEMIC POLICY AND PLANNING COMMITTEE (AP AND P)

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate specify that the Academic Policy and Planning Committee shall consist of at least nine members, but that the Academic Senate may approve a larger number. These members are nominated by the Committee on Committees after consultation with the Executive Committee, and are appointed by the Academic Senate. The Bylaws further require that at least two members shall be members of the Academic Senate, that at least two shall be students appointed by the Student Council, and that the Academic Vice President of the college shall serve as an ex officio member. No more than four members shall be from one school, and no member of the Executive Committee may be a member of the AP and P Committee. The term of service is three years, with approximately one-third elected each year.

The function of this Committee makes it particularly important that diverse points of view be represented. The Bylaws specify some diversity with the provisions that faculty, administration, and students shall be represented, and that no one school can have a majority of the members. Faculty members from five schools serve on the present Committee.

There are kinds of diversity not specified in the Bylaws which are also important. There was general agreement among Committee members who were interviewed that both "liberals" and "conservatives" are represented on the Committee. This variety apparently resulted from the efforts of a number of people who believed that a balanced committee was essential. The considerable differences in the length of time that members of the Committee have been on the faculty also contributes to diversity of points of view.

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate give the AP and P Committee responsibility "for recommending college-wide policies on such matters as, but not limited to, admissions, curriculum, research, staffing, space, and campus development." Thus, the Committee is charged with the development of policy relating to the academic program and its various ramifications. The academic program is, of course, at the heart of the college, and the faculty is primarily responsible for its development. In the past three years the Committee has made recommendations and initiated actions significantly affecting the educational program.

The AP and P Committee has responsibility for recommending the establishment of new majors, departments, divisions, and schools. Once established, however, the departments and schools have a substantial degree of autonomy in determining their curricula. The Committee delegated faculty review of course proposals primarily to the departments and schools when it recommended the abolition of the College Curriculum Committee. Now a new course may be offered when a department has the approval of a school curriculum committee (if one exists), the school Dean, and the Academic Vice President. The Committee depends on the faculty staffing formula and on the judgment and influence of the Academic Vice President to minimize the proliferation of courses.

The Committee proposed a new general education program which was approved by the Academic Senate. Within broad guidelines recommended by the Committee, each department will determine which courses it will designate or accept for the general education program.

Also, the AP and P Committee has provided an avenue for the introduction of experimental programs and has spent a substantial amount of time on policy and administrative matters concerning them. Subcommittees responsible to the main committee developed and supervised the Educational Opportunity Program, the Experimental College, and the Black Studies and La Raza chairs. The Committee views its administrative responsibility for such new programs as lasting only until an appropriate place is found for them in the college structure. The Committee also has responsibility for other subcommittees which supervise the Honors Program and the Teacher Education Program.

The Committee attempts to keep the faculty fully informed of all problems or proposals under consideration. It distributes minutes to departments, encourages faculty members to attend regular meetings of the Committee, and holds open hearings on important controversial issues.

The pressure of a long agenda has given the AP and P Committee little time to discuss the future character of the college. It is revealing to note that the Committee took little part in the recent revision of the College Master Plan, although one would expect that preparing such a plan would be one of its primary responsibilities. In point of fact, the Master Plan was drawn up in the office of the Academic Vice President in consultation with the schools, and the Committee gave it only token approval. The small role which the Committee played was accepted by the members for different reasons. These included lack of time, doubts about the value of long-range planning, or a conviction that the future was best reached by making one decision at a time and evaluating the implications of each action. The Committee members do not appear to see the Master Plan as a vehicle for expressing a comprehensive educational philosophy. In practice, the Plan appears to be little more than a compilation of the proposed majors and graduate programs agreed to at any one time by the schools and the administration.

Relationships with Other Committees

The Academic Policy and Planning Committee appoints the members of its subcommittees. After being given a general charge, the subcommittee works relatively independently unless it requests assistance. The chairman of the parent committee maintains contact with the subcommittees, and in addition a member of the AP and P Committee is assigned responsibility for liaison with each subcommittee. The subcommittee makes recommendations which the parent committee in practice usually accepts. Each subcommittee makes an annual report to the Committee. The respondents who discussed the subcommittees expressed general satisfaction with the relationships between them and the main committee.

The Academic Policy and Planning Committee is a committee of the Academic Senate. It therefore transmits its recommendations to the Executive Committee. Opinions differ concerning the amount of change that the Executive Committee has made in AP and P recommendations, but all agree that it has made substantial revisions. The AP and P Committee may revise its recommendations after the Executive Committee returns a report for reconsideration, or the Executive Committee may revise the recommendations without formal referral if, in the judgment of the chairman of AP and P, a referral would not result in any revision of the original report.

Communication between the two committees is good, consisting of the exchange of written communications and minutes, and attendance by the chairman of AP and P at all meetings of the Executive Committee.

Since programs recommended by AP and P affect levels of funding and distrubution of resources, effective liaison with the Budget Committee is essential. The functions of the Budget Committee and its relationship with AP and P are discussed in a later section.

Committees which are variously titled exist at the school level, with responsibilities paralleling those of the College Academic Policy and Planning Committee. There does not appear to be need for interaction unless a new major or department is involved. Agenda items come to AP and P from the office of the Academic Vice President and other administrative units, the Executive Committee, self-formed ad hoc committees, individual faculty members, and school councils, but only infrequently from a school curriculum or academic development committee. For the most part, the delegation of curriculum development to the schools has had the effect of ending the frequent interaction between school and college committees that existed previously.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The AP and P Committee provides a forum for general discussion of significant academic questions. A broad spectrum of viewpoints is represented. The atmosphere of the Committee's deliberations appears to encourage a reasonable expression of sharply differing views. This function of the Committee is important and should be continued.

2. The Committee provides a point of entry for academic innovation, and in so doing has made room for experimentation and flexibility. Two questions need to be raised concerning changes in the academic program: (A) Do they reflect growth by accretion rather than by plan? (B) Is there provision for systematic evaluation of new programs? The Committee should not itself undertake such evaluation, but should recommend the agency to do so, presumably the Office of Institutional Studies. Experimental programs should be evaluated in relation to their own goals and to the larger purposes of the college.
3. The Committee has not only accepted responsibility for recommending educational programs, but has frequently become involved in their administration as well. The survey team recognizes the need for a college-wide agency for general supervision and administration of programs which do not fit easily into the usual structure, but believes that the Academic Policy and Planning Committee should not be the agency. It is proper, however, for the Committee to make recommendations concerning the placement, academic development, evaluation, and administration of new, and especially, experimental programs. The team applauds the recent steps the Committee has taken to divest itself of administrative responsibilities.
4. The AP and P Committee appears to have been more likely to respond to proposals for innovation than to initiate them. This situation may be the result of the Committee's long agenda and the administrative responsibilities it still discharges. The Committee should now take more initiative in educational planning and innovation.

5. Decisions made by the AP and P Committee have gone far toward decentralizing faculty responsibility for development and review of curricula and for the general education program. A periodic examination of the educational effect of these decisions should be made by the Committee, perhaps as a joint effort with the appropriate school committees.
6. The Committee should consider proposals from its subcommittees as recommendations to the parent committee, and in the process of formulating final proposals the latter should continue to work closely with its subcommittees.
7. The survey team believes that the AP and P Committee should be the agency responsible for making policy recommendations concerning academic matters directly to the Academic Senate, as the Bylaws provide.
8. The Committee played only a token role in developing the College Master Plan. One of its most important functions should be to make long-range projections for the college.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE

The Personnel Committee is composed of eight members, seven of whom are elected faculty members who do not hold the position of department chairman, Dean of a school, or division director. The eighth member, ex officio, is the Academic Vice President of the college. The seven elected members serve three-year terms; approximately one-third of the members are elected each year.

Functions

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate make the following charge:

> The Faculty Personnel Committee shall be the deliberative body of the faculty on personnel policy and administration. Its function is to assist the executive officers of the college in formulating and administering policies and procedures through study, review, counsel, and recommendation. The scope of personnel matters coming within its purview include: tenure, academic freedom, leave of absence, appointment, release, dismissal, professional relations, promotion and grievances.

Personnel Policy. The role of the Personnel Committee in policy formulation and recommendation is not as great as the description in the Bylaws would suggest. In part, this diminished role results from determinations of policy by agencies outside the college. For example, aspects of sabbatical leave policy are determined by the Trustees of the California State Colleges, and policy on reappointment and tenure appears to be derived from Title 5 of the Administrative Code. In any case, it would appear that the Committee has chosen to deal with responsibilities other than policy making. Thus, at the request of the Personnel Committee, the Executive Committee appointed an ad hoc committee to review the Interim Personnel Document. Moreover, although the Personnel Committee, after holding hearings, did approve the recently proposed hiring guidelines, these were initially developed in the office of the Academic Vice President. The initiative in policy development does not appear to rest with the Committee.

Personnel Administration. The Personnel Committee is also the college-wide faculty body charged with making recommendations to the administration concerning retention, tenure, and leaves; recommendations concerning promotions are made through BORAP.

Recommendations on retention and tenure originate in the consultative body of the department. The Interim Document provides that the Personnel Committee "shall review all faculty departmental and other unit recommendations with respect to retention and tenure and shall forward to the appropriate executive officer reactions to the recommendations as submitted." The description of the Committee review given the team suggests that the Committee in point of fact makes what is essentially a procedural review. If no inconsistencies in recommendations or irregularities in procedures are found, Committee approval is typically automatic.

Recommendations for leaves are approved by the departments and Deans concerned before being submitted to the Personnel Committee. The Committee needs to give only token attention to requests for leave without pay. Developing a priority list for sabbatical leaves, however, consumes a great deal of Committee time because there are substantially more requests than there are leaves to be granted. Preparing recommendations on sabbatical leaves, tenure, and retention appears to occupy a large portion of the Committee's time.

The grievance procedures and the procedures for handling charges of unprofessional conduct involve the Personnel Committee at several points. The Committee advises the faculty member involved on procedures, and a Committee member serves as chairman of a hearing panel. The report of the hearing panel is given a procedural check by the Committee and then is forwarded to the President.

Relationships with Other Committees

The Personnel Committee receives agenda items from the Executive Committee and makes recommendations on personnel policy to the Executive Committee. The Personnel Committee typically does not consult with the Executive Committee until it has discussed an item and arrived at tentative conclusions. The Executive Committee has on occasion overruled recommendations made by the Personnel Committee as, for example, when the latter recommended that it should turn over to another committee the task of determining which faculty members should be honored as distinguished professors. The Executive Committee tends to repeat work done by the Personnel Committee when considering the latter's recommendations.

Beyond approving the policy under which the Board on Rank and Promotion operates, the Personnel Committee does not appear to have any other connection with BORAP, although the latter is technically a subcommittee of Personnel.

School Personnel Committees. The relationship between the college and school personnel committees was explored by an examination of the documents and by interviews. The documents of five schools, together with those describing the College Personnel Committee, were studied. The functions of the school committees differ somewhat from school to school, and they also differ in some ways from those of the college committee, but there are a number of parallel functions. At both levels the personnel committees are charged with developing personnel policy, with reviewing the retention and tenure recommendations, and with handling grievances. It would be reasonable to expect, therefore, that a functional relationship exists between the two levels. In point of fact, little evidence of such a relationship was found in the interviews with school and college committee members even where parallel functions obtain. One explanation may be that the school committees do not in practice perform certain functions described in their documents. For example, the interviews did not reveal any review of retention and tenure recommendations by three school committees, regardless of what the documents stated. In one situation, the school personnel committee is informed by the Dean of the tenure and retention recommendations made by the departments, but there is no committee review. In another school, the documents provide for the committee to have access to confidential files, but there is no need to consult them since the committee does not, in fact, review the personnel recommendations. In effect, the documents of these schools have been revised by practice to omit faculty review of certain personnel recommendations at the school level; the path for recommendations on tenure and retention runs from department to Dean to College Personnel Committee.

Another explanation for the lack of functional interaction between the two levels may simply be that the respective roles of the school and college committees are not clearly defined. In the description of grievance procedures, for example, the college document makes no reference to the school personnel committee, although it does mention the administrative officers of the school. The assumption would be that the first step in a grievance procedure should be to contact the college committee, yet the school documents include the handling of grievances among the functions of their personnel committees. One of the school documents gives the faculty member the right to decide whether he will start grievance procedures with the school or the college committee.

The lack of any broad-scale, systematic interaction between the committees was commented on by the persons interviewed. Additional evidence on this point was revealed when knowledgeable members of the college committee were unacquainted with the work of the school committees, or even of their number. This situation is in sharp contrast to the clearly defined relationship among the department, school, and and college levels in the Board on Rank and Promotion documents.

The survey team is not recommending a substantial elaboration of the documents to correct the ambiguous status of the school committee in personnel matters relating to tenure and retention. However, it may be important to determine why the role of the school committee is clear-cut in connection with promotions, but not with tenure and retention. No matter what the documents say, the pull of the department appears to be so strong in tenure that by common consent the documentary provisions are ignored. It is important that a conscious decision be made about the respective roles of the department, the school, and the college in these personnel matters.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The Bylaws and the Interim Document give major responsibility to the Personnel Committee for recommendation of personnel policy, the operation of faculty grievance procedures, and review of recommendations on retention, promotion, and tenure. The definition of responsibility given to the Committee seems to be essentially sound. No change is recommended.
2. The Personnel Committee as presently constituted is able to carry on its deliberations with the viewpoints of both faculty and administration represented. The survey team believes that the presence of the Academic Vice President on this Committee is a wise arrangement and should be continued.
3. A primary responsibility of the Personnel Committee is to make policy recommendations relating to personnel matters. In the opinion of the survey team, the Personnel Committee has not taken sufficient leadership in such matters as revision of the Interim Document or development of hiring guidelines. It is important for the Committee to receive suggestions from all sources, but coherent personnel policies emerge only when thoughtful consideration can be given to the interrelationships among the elements of personnel policy, and to any possible omissions. Such thoughtful consideration can come only from a committee which devotes time to this end.

   At least one respondent suggested that the Personnel Committee should not act on recommendations for retention and tenure if it is also to be involved in the grievance system only procedurally. Although the chairman of the grievance panel is a member of the Personnel Committee, he does not have a vote on the substance of the grievance issue, but is charged with the responsibility of determining that proper procedures are observed.

4. In order to have time to give more consideration to policy, the Personnel Committee should find ways to deal with the substantial amount of personnel administration for which it is responsible. A standing subcommittee could be established to determine priorities among persons recommended for sabbatical leave. The policy which governs this subcommittee's procedures should, of course, be formulated or at least approved by the Personnel Committee.
5. The time required for review of tenure and retention recommendations is substantial. Nevertheless, in the judgment of the survey team, the Personnel Committee should continue to review tenure and retention recommendations from the departments. Its present review tends to be procedural; the team urges that this review be made substantive. The quality of the persons who are retained and who are added to the tenured faculty should be the concern of the entire college.
6. The school Personnel Committees do not appear to be reviewing some personnel matters with which they are charged. The survey team recommends that they should exercise substantive faculty review of departmental recommendations on retention and tenure.

A further recommendation about the relationship between the BORAPs and the Personnel Committees will be included in the next section on BORAP.

BOARD ON RANK AND PROMOTION (BORAP)

The college BORAP is composed of five members elected by the faculty. Members serve three-year terms and are not eligible for re-election until an interval of one year after their terms have expired. No more than two members of the Board can be from any one school. Only full-time tenured professors and principal vocational instructors who are below the position of department chairman are eligible for membership on the Board. All members of the faculty who are eligible for election to the Board or whose promotion can be recommended to the Board are eligible to vote.

The college Bylaws provide that the college Personnel Committee shall establish a standing subcommittee which shall be designated as the Board on Rank and Promotion. The purposes of the Board are:

1. To develop, for the Personnel Committee's review, policy recommendations related to promotion in rank and advancement in class.
2. To present to the President each year its recommendations with respect to promotion priorities of the college staff.

As stated previously, BORAP is a subcommittee of the Personnel Committee. BORAP does not appear to have any significant relationships with committees other than Personnel. Generally, the function of the Personnel Committee is to deal with policy on tenure, academic freedom, leaves of absence, appointment, promotion in rank, release, dismissal, and professional relations and grievances. The functions of BORAP are to present to the President its recommendations with respect to promotion priorities, and to develop for the Personnel Committee's review policy recommendations concerning promotion in rank and advancement in class. Relationships between BORAP and Personnel are clear at the college level, although there is some faculty dissatisfaction with the Personnel Committee, which is currently under study. The school BORAPs appear to be functioning adequately, although relationships between school personnel committees and school BORAP committees are somewhat nebulous.

Problems in the BORAP System

Of all the committees surveyed in the report, the various BORAPs appear to be the ones that operate most consistently with the duties and procedures specified for them in the documents. Nevertheless, some problems do exist. First, and most importantly, there is a growing and serious philosophical split concerning policy on promotion. One group of faculty members feels that all possible promotions should be made, because of the needs of people in the system for both financial and professional advancement. This group registers dissatisfaction over unfilled positions. A second group of faculty feels that promotions should depend on carefully evaluated qualifications. This second group takes the position that the academic standing of the college is at stake in the rigorousness with which clear-cut qualifications for promotion are applied in individual cases.

A second problem arises from the lack of clear and uniform criteria for promotion. The faculty documents provide that "each school and department may employ its own set of criteria for promotion which may be more detailed but not less restrictive than those contained in the Faculty Handbook." This lack of uniformity presents a difficult problem when the college BORAP has one position available with two candidates who have been judged by two different departments or schools on somewhat different criteria. Another problem arises when a choice must be made between the promotion of an older man close to retirement (so he can get higher benefits) or a younger man of superior qualifications.

The problem of uniformity of criteria in advancement was best summed up by one respondent who said, "Perhaps we could get all the criteria plugged into a computer and simply run the cards through, but I prefer to deal with human errors in this matter." However, human judgment might be greatly improved if criteria were defined more clearly and explicitly and methods of securing relevant data were carried out more adequately. For example, devices for securing valid and reliable evidence on teaching effectiveness--the first criterion for promotion listed on page 50 of the Faculty Handbook--should be adopted and systematically applied.

Finally, some respondents suggested that it is possible for a school to "load" its BORAP list by giving high priority to relatively unqualified candidates as a means of forcing their promotion. While this is indeed a possibility, it also appears to be somewhat improbable. The vital importance of promotions to all parties concerned--the individuals, the schools, and the college--appears to have generally precluded this kind of manipulation so far.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Generally, it appears that the BORAP committees function well. However, there are several factors which the college should consider as means of making the promotion process more effective.

1. Advancement should be based on the qualifications of the candidates, not merely on the availability of openings at higher ranks. Furthermore, the survey team strongly disapproves the present practice of virtually automatic advancement from one step to another within ranks. The practices of making as many promotions as are possible and of automatic advancement within ranks can easily produce academic mediocrity.
2. More effective liaison between the BORAP and personnel committees should be developed, especially at the school level. The possibility of combining the school BORAP and personnel committees into one committee should be considered. The present school committees do not function effectively in relation to personnel. Combining the two committees into one might facilitate more effective consideration of personnel questions at the school level without unduly burdening the members of the committee. There is much to be gained with respect both to policy formation and evaluation of

qualifications by having a single committee perform both functions.

3. Unless the work load clearly precludes it, the Personnel and BORAP Committees should also be combined at the college level, for the same reasons advanced for consolidation at the lower level. This Committee's time might be saved by having the office of the Academic Vice President, who should be an ex officio member of the combined Committee, provide needed clerical service, such as assembling folders, supplying statistical data, etc. It should be understood, of course, that the administrative office would play only a facilitating, rather than a determining role in the work of what is essentially a faculty committee.
4. The criteria for promotion should be reexamined, more clearly defined, and more effectively applied than they now are. The present statement of qualifications is vague and open to different interpretations. Criteria for advancement should reflect the goals of the college and the balance to be attained among them. This, of course, requires the college to develop a clear statement of objectives and well-defined means of attaining them.
5. The potential for manipulating the BORAP system by loading the promotion lists as noted above is real, although no evidence has been found that this has occurred as yet. The possibility of manipulation should be carefully studied and effective measures to avoid it should be devised and consistently applied.

BUDGET COMMITTEE

The College Budget Committee is composed of nine members appointed by the Academic Senate, with no more than four from any one school. None shall be a member of the Executive Committee; at least two shall be members of the Academic Senate. The chief financial officer of the college is a member ex officio. There is one student member. The term of the faculty members is three years, with one-third of the members elected each year. The chairman is elected by the members of the Committee.

Interviews

The research team interviewed the chairman of the College Budget Committee, the chairmen of budget committees in two school, and the Dean of a school in which there is no special budget committee. The Academic Vice President and the Business Manager were also consulted about the budgeting process. Several budget documents were made available, including memoranda by the Business Manager on "Preparation of the 1968-69 Support Budget Request" and on "Formulas and Guidelines for Instructional Positions."

Interviews with other administrative officers touched on the functions of the Budget Committee and its relations with other committees.

Functions

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate provide that:

> The Budget Committee shall review, formulate, and make recommendations with respect to budget planning and resource use as they affect the college. The Committee shall be responsible for recommending policy on all college budget decisions with respect to apportioning resources among the various schools and divisions of the college.

Activities

It is apparent that the Budget Committee has not yet begun to perform all of the broad functions assigned to it by the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Much of the business referred to the Committee concerns such matters as the distribution of travel funds rather than the broad allocation of resources in the college. The Academic Vice President has not asked the Committee to propose guidelines for the allocation of staff among the schools and divisions. Only this year has he begun to send the Committee a record of staff allocations, and this for informational purposes only. The requests of the schools and divisions for additional instructional staff are submitted directly to the Vice President for Academic Affairs; they do not flow through the Budget Committee, and to date, at any rate, the Vice President has not asked the Committee to comment on the requests of the schools or to offer advice either on specific proposals or on the principles under which the staff allocations might be made.

The equipment category is one of the largest in the college budget. At present it is allocated among the schools by the Academic Vice President. At least one respondent said that although equipment is one of the largest budget items, the Budget Committee may be so uninformed about the detailed needs of schools and departments as to make it desirable for an administrator to continue to make the specific allocations.

Requests for noninstructional support are submitted to the Business Manager, who reviews them before submitting the proposed college budget to the Chancellor's office. After the approved budget is finally transmitted to the college by the Chancellor, the Business Manager makes the internal allocations of equipment, operating expense, secretarial assistance, clerical help, etc., on the basis of his appraisal of departmental and school needs. These allocations are reviewed with the Deans, one by one. The Budget Committee has not be concerned with the distribution of funds for noninstructional support.

Budget Policy

It was difficult for the survey team to discover exactly how the budget is made, and it is apparent that many members of the faculty share this mystification. The Business Manager, however, has tried to provide information to the Budget Committee on the bases for construction of the college budget. Under date of December 18, 1966, he sent the Committee a memorandum on "Formulas, guidelines and standards used to establish need and to request positions for the instructional and library functions in annual budget requests." This memorandum supplied information on the formulas which, in large part, determine the operating budget for the institution. These formulas cover instructional positions, the so-called support staff, and equipment. It has been said that the budget is so determined by explicit formulas that it would be virtually possible for a central administrative officer of the college to submit a proposed budget to the Chancellor's office without any prior submissions from the schools and divisions.

The Budget Committee has reviewed budget formulas and has urged the state-wide Academic Senate to propose that the formulas be revised and updated.

The Chancellor's office follows a policy of submitting requests for the financing of new programs and for program augmentation outside and beyond the sums generated by formulas. In recent practice, the Department of Finance has not been generous in approving such proposals, and even when they have survived the actions of the Department and the appropriations of the legislature, the Governor has eliminated most of them. For example, in the last budget the only augmentation approved for the state college system was for an expansion of data processing equipment and staff.

It is apparent that the failure to secure support for new programs and for the strengthening of those already in existence has hindered the educational development of the college. Furthermore, the lack of developmental funds has in effect curtailed the functions of the Budget Committee.

Nevertheless, our respondents said that the Committee should be concerned with the allocation of major resources, especially those allocated for augmentation and new programs. It was said that the Budget Committee wishes to set up guidelines for the allocation of staff among the schools and divisions and to provide the central administration with a list of recommended priorities. It was also said that such recommendations should not tie the hands of the Academic Vice President, who presumably will continue to submit his own recommendations for the allocation of resources according to his perception of those special needs of the several schools which may justify exceptions to the broad guidelines proposed by the Budget Committee. The survey staff found no desire on the part of the respondents with whom it discussed the functions of the Budget Committee for the Committee to review and propose detailed budget items. The survey team concurs that it would be unwise for the Committee to attempt to make a line-item budget.

Relationships with Other Committees

There appears to be insufficient liaison of collaboration between the Budget Committee and the AP and P Committee. In the judgment of one respondent, at least, the AP and P Committee has been insufficiently concerned about the means of funding the programs it approves, although it expects to have these programs financed.

For example, the AP and P Committee may propose a new program requiring instructional staff; but since no students will be involved at that stage to generate faculty positions, the cost of instruction either has to be taken "off the top" of the instructional allocation for the college, or the necessary funds or staff must be contributed by one or more schools or divisions. Such adjustments may be necessary when new graduate programs are established or an experimental college created.

It was suggested that the recommendations of the AP and P Committee involving budgetary resources and allocations should be transmitted to the Budget Committee for consideration and possible recommendation. The survey team concurs with this suggestion, but it does not propose that the latter committee should exercise control over the educational programs recommended by the AP and P Committee. Without disturbing the educational priorities proposed by AP and P, the Budget Committee should advise the AP and P Committee and the Academic Vice President of the problems of availability and allocation of resources, as these considerations may affect the recommendations of the AP and P Committee.

Lack of Master Planning

Even if the Budget Committee should concern itself with the broad allocation of resources among the programs and organizational units of the college, it would be severely handicapped by the fact that the college really has not charted its directions. Until long-range plans are made, there will really be no way of shaping the educational program intelligently and of determining priorities for financial support.

Budgetary Flexibility

One of the most serious and frustrating difficulties under which the state colleges have had to labor is excessive budgetary control by the State Finance Department and, in some instances, by the Chancellor's office. Beginning with the Strayer Committee report of 1947, each major survey of higher education in California has recommended that the general control and review of expenditures in the state colleges should be placed in the hands of the governing authority of the colleges and its executive officer. The Master Plan of 1960 asserted that, subject to the control of the legislature and the Governor over the general level of support for the colleges, the governing board of the system should be given full responsibility for the expenditure of funds appropriated to it. "Line-item, pre-audit, and other detailed fiscal controls by the State Department of Finance should be terminated," said the Master Plan. "Full fiscal authority should be vested in the governing board." Good administrative practice would require the governing board to delegate a large measure of authority to the Chancellor, with the expectation that he, in turn, would delegate a large degree of fiscal authority over internal operations to the Presidents of the colleges.

As a matter of fact, somewhat greater flexibility in fiscal administration and somewhat greater autonomy for the governing board, the Chancellor, and the heads of the colleges have been attained. For example, on the basis of the staffing formula, the State Finance Department allocates instructional positions in a block to the system, and the Chancellor, in turn, allocates a total number of faculty positions to each institution, which can then distribute these positions as it sees fit.

On the other hand, there would seem still to be excessive central control over line-item transfers in the budget. Apparently considerable ground is still to be gained in internal fiscal administration.

School Budget Committees

The survey staff interviewed the chairmen of two school budget committees, and discussed the budgetary process with the Dean of another school which has no such committee. In one of the former schools, each department elects one representative to the budget committee and one member is elected at large. Apparently the committee carries little responsibility. Its major activity is to make recommendations concerning the allocation of travel money and student-paper readers. The committee advises the Dean on departmental allocations for instructional equipment if he so desires. It was said, however, that the committee in fact knows so little about this matter that it trusts the Dean to act with whatever informal consultation with committee members he desires.

The chairman of this school budget committee said that he attended three meetings of the college-wide Budget Committee simply as an observer. He said that his school has a representative on the College Budget Committee, but at the moment he doesn't know who he is. The chairman said that he really doesn't know how the allocation of funds is made at the college level among the several schools and divisions.

In the second school, the budget committee of nine members is elected by the academic council. The committee's most important function is staff allocation; for the current year the school got some 43 new positions out of a total of 150 allocated to the college. In addition, the committee is concerned with such matters as travel and equipment. In practice, the Dean presents a well-documented set of recommendations for the distribution of staff and operating funds, which the committee usually accepts with little question. The allocations are made with little or no review at the college level.

In the school with no budget committee, each department has a consultative committee for budget formulation. The Dean reviews the departments' requests and makes tentative decisions without the assistance of a formal recommending body. He takes these tentative allocations to his cabinet of department chairmen and presents the rationale for his decisions. Department chairmen may appeal these decisions to him if they so desire.

Again, the Dean of this school can make internal budget allocations with little detailed review from above.

If the budgetary processes in these three schools is indicative of the institution as a whole, the relationship between the College Budget Committee and the school committees and Deans is indeed tenuous. The lack of communication between the two levels is probably a reflection of the relatively minor role which the College Budget Committee has played to date in establishing guidelines for the allocation of resources and in reviewing the budgetary implications of proposed changes in the academic program. The fact that two school budget committee chairmen testified that they did not really know how resources were allocated among the schools and divisions emphasizes again the widespread lack of knowledge about how the budget of the college is actually made and how it is then administered.

Conclusions and Recommendations

1. The functions of the College Budget Committee as stated in the Constitution are soundly conceived. Although the Committee has not fully carried out these functions, it should now proceed to do so with the full cooperation of the appropriate administrative officers and the several school budget committees. It should be clear that the Budget Committee has no control over educational priorities--for example, over the recommendations and priorities of the AP and P Committee. The former's function should be to advise the AP and P Committee on the budgetary implications of its proposals.
2. The Budget Committee, in collaboration with the appropriate administrative officers and faculty committees, should formulate broad policies and basic guidelines for the allocation of resources, and should not be tempted to dissipate its time in reviewing detailed budgetary items. It is appropriate, however, for the Committee to consider the budgetary implications for the college as a whole of educational programs, instructional and administrative services, internal organization, and administrative staffing proposed by Senate committees, administrative committees, administrative officers, and the several schools and divisions, and to submit its comments to the appropriate parties.

   This is not to suggest that the College Budget Committee should intrude in matters which are purely the province of the schools. However, actions taken in one part of the college may in fact materially affect the affairs of other schools and the distribution of resources within the college as a whole. The Budget Committee should be sensitive to these relationships.

3. The Budget Committee should serve in an advisory capacity to other committees and to administrators.
4. The process of formulating and administering college and school budgets should be clarified, and information concerning fiscal administration should be more widely disseminated.

   It is especially important to clarify the several loci of authority in budgetary decision making and, again, to distribute this information widely. The members of college and school budget committees, at least, should know how the budget is constructed, who makes the final decisions, and, broadly speaking, the bases on which resources are allocated.
5. The survey staff believes that the President's office should take clear responsibility for the budget's final shape. It should be clear that the President submits the proposed budget to the Chancellor. It should be equally clear that the President's office is the final administrative authority for the fiscal operation of the institution, under approved policies and established methods of consultation.
6. Since the budget is a financial plan for carrying out the educational purposes of the college, the Academic Vice President or his representative should be made a member of the Budget Committee ex officio.

COMPOSITION OF MAJOR COMMITTEES

This study of faculty participation in major committees was designed to provide the basis for judging the representativeness of the Academic Senate and of selected college and Senate committees; and to determine the extent of faculty participation in committee work. The basic data were collected and collated by the Office of Institutional Studies.

The promotion lists for two years, 1963-64 and 1968-69, were analyzed to determine the distribution of the teaching faculty of the college by school and department, sex, rank, age, duration of appointment, and highest degree.

The membership of the Academic Senate and the following eight committees was also analyzed for the years 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69: 1) Executive Committee, 2) Personnel Committee, 3) Student Affairs Committee, 4) Academic Policy and Planning Committee, 5) Committee on Committees, 6) Board on Rank and Promotion, 7) Consultative Procedures Committee, and 8) Budget Committee. The number of college and Senate committees on which each individual on the fall 1968 promotion list had served was tabulated in order to determine the incidence of faculty participation in committee activity. The representativeness of committee members for the period 1966-67 to 1968-69 was determined by comparing their characteristics with those of the faculty on the 1968-69 promotion list.

Schools and Departments

The Bylaws of the Academic Senate limit the membership of the Budget, AP and P, Student Affairs and Public Affairs Committees to no more than four members from one school. The cumulative three-year membership of each of these committees, except Public Affairs, was examined to determine whether this requirement unduly discriminated against any one school (Appendix, Table 5). Approximately 40 to 43 percent of the appointments to these three committees came from the School of Arts and Sciences, while the combined appointments from the Schools of Professional Studies and Business ranged from 14 to 27 percent. The School of Business had no representation on the Student Affairs Committee, and the School of Engineering had no representation on AP and P. The only committee on which the Division of Social Work was represented was AP and P.

BORAP and the Budget and Executive Committees drew from 41 to 44 percent of their members from the School of Arts and Sciences. The School of Professional Studies had no representation on BORAP, while the School of Engineering was not represented on the Executive Committee. The Committee on Committees and the Personnel Committee both had 54 percent of their members from Arts and Sciences. The Schools of Education and Engineering were not represented on the Committee on Committees, while the Schools of Agriculture and Engineering were not represented on the Personnel Committee. The Consultative Procedures Committee has had only six members, four of whom were from the School of Arts and Sciences.

Sex

Except for the Personnel Committee, each of the committees studied had a lower proportion of women than the all-college proportion (Appendix, Table 4). No women served as chairmen of the committees studied. However, women served on certain key committees like the Personnel and Executive Committees.

Seniority

The survey team was interested in the extent to which committee membership was concentrated in the upper professional ranks, among those who held the doctoral degree, among older faculty, or among those who had been at the college for a longer period of time.

As expected, full professors and faculty members holding the doctoral degree were over-represented (Appendix, Table 4). Although professors comprised 25 percent of the entire faculty, the proportion of full professors ranged from 53 percent on the AP and P Committee to 83 percent (five of the total of six) on the Consultative Procedures Committee. The Budget and Student Affairs Committees were exceptions to this pattern; their percentages of professors were only 31 and 18, respectively. BORAP is, of course, comprised solely of full professors or principal vocational instructors.

Persons with the doctoral degree comprised only 48 percent of the faculty at large, but members who held the doctorate ranged from 56 percent of the Budget Committee to 100 percent of the Consultative Procedures Committee.

Finally, committee members were older and had been at the college longer than the faculty as a whole (Appendix, Table 4). Here again, members of the Student Affairs Committee were the exception; their average age was lower than the all-college average. Their average length of time at the college was two years less than the next lowest committee, and just greater than the average for the college.

The presence of relatively senior faculty on committees is to be expected, but there is no apparent attempt to limit committee service to the elders. The team applauds the fact that several assistant and associate professors are also active on committees. Nevertheless, more members at those ranks should be appointed.

Extent of Participation

Among the members of the Academic Assembly in the fall of 1968, 239 or 36 percent had served on at least one committee since 1966-67 (Appendix, Table 6). When the 115 new faculty appointments in the summer and fall of 1968 were subtracted from the promotion list, the proportion of Assembly members who had served on a committee rose to 44 percent of those eligible when most of the appointments were made.

Fifty-six persons served on three or more different committees during the three-year period. The survey team believes it is unwise to concentrate both the opportunity and burden of committee service too heavily on too few Assembly members.

Conclusions

1. The membership of the committees studied has been widely spread among many schools. The small size of some committees makes it apparent that not all schools can be represented on each committee in each year.
2. While committee members tend to be senior members of the faculty in terms of rank, highest degree, age, and years at the college, the survey team uncovered no monopoly of committee service based on these characteristics.
3. There appear to be two committees whose members differed from the seniority pattern. Sixty-five percent of the members of the Student Affairs Committee were associate and assistant professors. The corresponding percentage for the Budget Committee was 44. The average age and duration of appointment of members of the Student Affairs Committee were both less than the college average for other committees.
   These two committees appear to constitute an entry point into the governance system for lower academic ranks and younger faculty members. Elsewhere in this report the team has noted that the Budget Committee has not been very active.
4. Approximately four of every ten persons eligible served on committees. Fifty-six people had been on three or more committees.

Recommendations

1. The survey team believes that rigid adherence to proprotional representation on major committees by each school would not be the best policy. It recommends that the Committee on Committees and other appointing agencies keep "regional" representation in mind. Such representation would take into account the long-range distribution of appointments by groups of schools, while at the same time providing the flexibility necessary to appoint dynamic and viable committees.
2. The Committee on Committees and other appointing agencies should avoid putting an individual on more than one or two committees simultaneously. Elsewhere in this study, the survey team makes a plea for some new faces in the committee system for personal reasons. The data presented here argue for a more equitable distribution of the work load.
3. It would be desirable to include more assistant and associate professors on major Senate and college committees.

Summary

1. The Academic Senate should be revitalized as a deliberative and legislative body. To that end, the Executive Committee should cease to act substantively on the reports of Senate and college-wide committees, which hereafter should report directly to the Senate itself or to the President of the college, as may be appropriate. The Executive Committee should serve only as an agenda and coordinating agency, unless action is essential when the Senate is not in session or cannot be promptly convened.

2. The Committee on Committees could more easily and directly discharge its constitutional obligation to nominate the members of college-wide committees in consultation with the President (Constitution of the Academic Assembly, Article II, Section 6) if it were to be composed as follows: five members elected by the Academic Senate, one member appointed by the President of the college, and the President, ex officio. The legislation necessary to effect this change should be introduced.
3. The Academic Policy and Planning Committee should take more initiative in educational planning and innovation. In cooperation with the office of the Academic Vice President, the Committee should take major responsibility for developing a long-range academic plan for the college--a plan it does not now really possess. Without such a projection, periodically updated, no rationale will exist for phasing out or revising old programs, for adopting new programs, or for allocating resources. The Committee should see that the appropriate agency evaluates new and experimental educational programs. The Committee should gain time for these major activities by divesting itself of all administrative responsibilities.
4. The College Personnel Committee should play a more active role in developing and evaluating personnel policies. With BORAP, the Committee should establish uniform qualifications for retention, advancement, and promotion, and more systematic means of appraising candidates' qualifications. The college and school committees should collaborate in attaining these objectives.
5. The personnel and BORAP committees should be combined at the school level. Unless the work load clearly precludes it, the

two college committees should also be consolidated. If the college wishes to improve its academic stature significantly, it should base advancement within ranks on merit. Promotions should be based on candidates' qualifications, not on the number of open "slots" in the higher ranks.

6. The Budget Committee should formulate broad policies and general guidelines for the allocation of resources among the major units and functions of the college. It should advise the AP and P Committee concerning budgetary implications of proposed changes in educational programs or in academic and administrative organization. The Committee should be aware of budgetary policies and practices in one part of the college which may materially affect fiscal administration elsewhere in the institution.
7. Committee participation has been fairly widespread. During the three-year period studied, approximately four of every ten eligible persons had served on one or more committees. Fifty-six had been on three or more committees. This suggests, and the survey team recommends, that the work load should be more equitably distributed. Simultaneous committee membership especially should be avoided as one means of precluding the concentration of power in a limited number of persons. Finally, more assistant and associate professors should be appointed to major Senate and college committees. The survey team believes that the changes it has proposed above in the composition, functions, and activities of major committees will make faculty government more effective and faculty-administrative relationships more productive.

III

Joint Participation in Decision Making

In writing this report, the survey team accepted the basic premise that the faculty and academic administrators should participate fully in the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the administrative and academic environment (Faculty Handbook, p. 7). The team concurs with the Constitution for the Academic Assembly when it provides, in the preamble, that ". . .the faculty body should have responsibility and authority to develop and recommend policies and should be consulted on all academic policy matters by the President of the College."

The survey team observes that consultation should proceed in two directions: Faculty bodies should confer freely with administrators in formulating proposals, and administrators should consult with faculty agencies in arriving at considered judgments. The present part of the report is concerned with procedures and attitudes related to the effectiveness of faculty-administrative collaboration.

One of the first questions that arises is: At what stages in the consultative processes should administrators become involved? The Assembly Constitution states that ". . .the President of the College is authorized to delegate functions to and consult with the faculty, but is charged with final responsibility for and given final authority over the College." This provision does not, and should not, preclude faculty initiative; perhaps most proposals for the development of the college will originate with the faculty. Does this mean that the President's first contact with a proposal should be when a consultative body lays a recommendation on his desk? The same question is relevant to the relations of other administrators with faculty bodies.

Another question concerns the sources of initiative and leadership in the college. One would hope that many ideas would originate in the faculty. Should administrators then play only a passive role in policy formation? Or is there room in joint participation for administrative initiative, stimulation, and evaluation? Is there an opportunity for administrative leadership in the consultative procedures of the college?

Another question to which this part of the report is addressed is: To whom should the administrators of the college and the schools be accountable? What does the pattern of accountability suggest concerning the parties who should participate in the selection of administrators?

After looking at the decision-making processes at Fresno State, one must confront the issue of how far the college should go in decentralizing the responsibility for curriculum, educational policy, and the selection and advancement of faculty members.

Effective faculty-administrative interaction, the report emphasizes, is a matter both of informal communication and of formal consultation. The formal consultative procedures under which the college is now attempting to operate provide the structure and legitimacy for joint participation. The survey team therefore examined the Consultative Procedures documents as thoroughly as possible in the time available, with the purpose of appraising their relevance to the basic distribution of responsibility and authority in the college. The survey team also tried to reach its own conclusion respecting what was said to be the unnecessary complexity of specified procedures.

Effective joint decision making is not only the product of formal consultative procedures. It is also the result of the manner in which the participants resolve differences in coming to conclusions. One expects controversy in a dynamic educational institution.

Does he also need to expect a contentious atmosphere, the politics of confrontation, and factional struggles for power? The survey team was deeply concerned about these questions.

THE AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

As pointed out in the *Faculty Handbook*, the California State Colleges are included in the Master Plan for Higher Education adopted by the legislature in the Donahoe Act of 1960 and subsequent amendments. The Act specifies that the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges shall have "the powers, duties and functions with respect to management and control of the State Colleges. . . /*California Education Code*, Section 22,604/." The Chancellor is the administrative director of the colleges.

Presidential Authority

The *California Administrative Code*, Title 5, gives the President of the college, under the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor of the state college system, authority over a wide range of college affairs including curriculum, academic personnel, business administration, and public relations. In matters of curriculum and educational program, the President acts on the recommendation of various academic bodies in the institution (Section 40,105). The Code directs each college to develop procedures under which tenured members of the faculty make recommendations to the President on academic personnel (Sections 42,701 and 42,702). The President of the college has been given the authority to approve most decisions concerning the appointment, promotion, and tenure of the academic staff in accordance with recognized consultative procedures.

However, the complicated system of organization and governance of the college introduces many checks on arbitrary exercise of presidential authority. For example, the state college system requires each college establish grievance procedures for academic employees. Furthermore, Fresno State has adopted a complicated set of consultative procedures regulating the processes of joint participation in decision making between the faculty and the President. Consultative procedures also govern faculty-administrative relationships in the schools and departments.

As pointed out earlier, the stage for joint participation is set in the composition of the Academic Assembly, the Academic Senate, and the major Senate and college committees. The survey team has recommended certain changes in the composition of these committees; the principal proposal is to make the President a member of the Committee on Committees.

Joint Participation

The stage at which faculty-administrative interaction should take place is a moot point. One position is that administrators should not participate in the early stages of the decision-making process, but that in effect there should be consultation only at the end and at the top, when a fully developed proposal or recommendation is placed before the administrator for his approval or disapproval.

A second view is that administrators (whether Deans, Vice Presidents, or President) should become involved in deliberations on important matters at early stages, and should participate throughout the decision-making process. Only a limited number of respondents said that they held the first position, and most of them generally supported the second. The survey team takes the second position, although it recognizes that the stage at which administrative participation occurs may vary with the matter under consideration and with the level at which it originates.

When one of the Deans was asked if administrative participation at early stages might not evoke the charge of administrative intimidation, he replied that this is essentially a matter of appropriate style. It would be undesirable, he said, for an administrator always to present a proposal for faculty consideration or action. It would be more appropriate in most instances for him to raise questions, to pose problems, and to participate with other members of the group in the ensuing discussion.

Some examples of the different stages at which major administrators might participate appropriately in decision making may be useful. In the appointment of promotion of faculty members, the Deans presumably would participate at relatively early stages and the Academic Vice President at a later point. In the case of decisions on retention, the Deans again would participate early; the Academic Vice President would participate later by virtue of his membership on the Personnel Committee. In general, on faculty personnel matters the Academic Vice President would be concerned primarily, but not exclusively, with considerations that transcend the interests of a particular department or school.

In curricular matters, the Deans may be expected to participate at early stages and the Academic Vice President at a later point. This is not to suggest that the survey team believes that the review of courses and curricula by the Academic Vice President should be merely perfunctory. In curricular matters, the Vice President should be concerned with important interrelationships among schools and with questions of college-wide policy. For example, he should be concerned with the distribution of fields of specialization among departments and schools, unnecessary and uneconomic duplication of courses and educational programs, and the courses which one school should offer for students from other parts of the college. The report will have more to say on this subject in a later section.

The Academic Vice President, as a member of the AP and P Committee, is in a position to take part in the formation of educational policy, including decisions on the creation of new departments, the approval of majors and specialized curricula, the organization of new schools or other administrative units, the development of experimental and specialized programs, and the appropriate administrative placement of new programs. As pointed out earlier, the Vice President should engage the AP and P Committee much more actively than in the past in the development of a master plan for the academic development of the college.

A respondent who asserted that consultation should take place only after a faculty body has made a decision, pointed out that if an administrator had an opportunity to vote in committee as decisions were being made, he would get a second chance to veto them and thus in effect would have an opportunity to act twice on the same issue. This point of view does not have the survey team's sympathy. Many respondents pointed out that an administrator--whether it be the President in the Executive Committee or the Academic Vice President in one of the committees of which he is a member--ordinarily withholds his vote on committee recommendations on which he must act administratively at a later time. This seems to the survey team to be an appropriate restraint; on the other hand, the team sees no reason why the administrator should not participate actively in the committee's deliberation. Very few respondents appeared to be persons who would be intimidated by administrators.

Avoidance of Vetoes. The team points out that if interaction between faculty agencies and administrators is effective, administrators will veto committee recommendations only under the most extraordinary circumstances. For example, no substantive vetoes of major educational programs recommended by the AP and P Committee have been uncovered by the survey team. On the assumption that there is free exchange of views and full disclosure of information on the part of faculty members and administrators, the survey team believes that the kind of joint participation in decision making which has characterized the AP and P Committee will in the long run be productive of general morale and sound educational planning.

Informal Communication. The emphasis above has been on formal consultation, but informal discussion is also a highly important form of faculty-administrative interaction.

Certain respondents charged that some faculty members--and presumably some administrators as well--have circumvented the formal consultative procedures and the formal line of authority by conferring directly with various officials. The survey team understands that, especially in an atmosphere of distrust, some members of the staff would look with suspicion on informal discussion of college problems, especially if it is with administrators. The survey team, however, does not concur in this attitude so long as no commitments are made in the course of informal conferences, and formal decisions are made as formal relationships require, that is, with faithful adherence on the part of both faculty members and administrators to the formal provisions for consultation and orderly faculty-faculty, faculty-administration, and administration-administration relationships.

This report will return to the subject of joint faculty-administrative participation in decision making in later sections which deal in greater detail with the consultative procedures and with the problem of centralization versus decentralization in decision making.

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Shared responsibility for decision making raises special questions of educational leadership, initiation, and planning. In a vital educational community, initiative and leadership should be widely dispersed. It is generally agreed, however, that the principal executive officers of a college or university have a special responsibility for turning the eyes of all members of the institution toward the future. The President of the college, says the Faculty Handbook, is "responsible for the educational effectiveness and academic excellence of the College."

With very few exceptions, respondents either accepted or emphasized the importance of educational leadership by major administrators. One faculty member, for example, stated that faculties need to sense strong leadership on the part of President, Vice President, and school Deans. These staff members, he said, should set the tone of the college and articulate its purposes. Another respondent remembered that the challenge which President Ness gave when he came to the college gave impetus to educational change. There was some disagreement about the President's subsequent leadership.

The respondent who, in another context, objected to administrative participation early in the decision-making process, nevertheless declared that the faculty was not getting needed leadership in educational policy from the central administration. He stated that few major proposals had emanated from the offices of the President and his close administrative associates. Another respondent criticized the central administration for not freeing itself sufficiently from detail and from outside contacts to exercise imaginative educational leadership. That this criticism may not be entirely valid is suggested by the fact that the central administration was involved at a very early stage in the development of such activities as the Educational Opportunity Program.

Leadership

It is safe to say that the respondents who asked for more administrative initiative did not mean arbitrary authority. Most acts of leadership are not dramatic; the era of the administrative giant who made over a college according to his own design has ended. But administrative initiative is not antithetical to democratic processes. Administrators should not only respond; they should question, evaluate, propose, stimulate.

Perhaps the leader's primary task is to mobilize the human resources of an organization toward the attainment of clearly defined goals. These goals should be well understood and widely accepted. This means that they must be formulated through the participation of all those concerned with the welfare and growth of the college--administrators, faculty members, students.

Goals once decided on are not likely to be good forever. There should be continuing dialogue about their validity, about the means necessary for their attainment, and about the discipline they should impose on the institution's activities. Such study and debate should stimulate initiative and innovation throughout the organization.

The administrative leader performs a number of vital functions:

1. Searching for new ideas wherever they may be found and to help bring these ideas to fruition. It has been said that the major role of academic leadership is to release the imagination and the inventiveness of teachers, scholars, and students.
2. Helping innovators find allies. Most proposals for change need the support of many individuals and many groups, especially if the innovators are younger faculty members. In other words, administrators can help recruit established and distinguished teachers for new educational projects as a means of reducing the risk to those promoting change. The administrator can often play a key role in mobilizing support in what is usually a relatively conservative organization.
3. Emphasizing institution-wide interests rather than sectional ambitions. As was said earlier in this report, a mere collection of the aspirations of particular and diverse interest groups will not add up to a coherent educational program or to an institution with integrity of character and purpose.
4. Stimulating a thorough analysis of the problems facing the institution and to search out possibly fruitful alternatives for solution. Failure to deal with problems imaginatively is often the result of a poverty of ideas.
5. Breaking down departmental insulation to bring about greater contact among disciplines,

and enabling inventive minds to find their counterparts in other parts of the institution.

6. Keeping faculty informed of state-wide and system-wide policies and developments.
7. Commenting on trends in higher education in the United States and other countries.

Informal Communication. Leadership rests on effective formal methods of consultation and participation. But as a search for ideas, leadership depends to a high degree on informal relationships. Because most contemporary educational institutions are complexly organized and highly specialized, and because the problems of management (as somewhat distinct from leadership) are therefore extremely demanding, the informality that characterized a simpler academic community is now difficult to attain. Nevertheless, discussion with administrative colleagues, faculty members, and students around the fountain, in the dining room, or in faculty and student lounges may be highly productive. Administrative offices should be open to faculty and students, and faculty offices should be open to administrative visitors. This informal interchange will occur only if administrators determinedly put aside the busywork which is often an escape from responsibility and leave the security of their desk chairs.

The President's Staff. Although he accepts responsibility for broad educational leadership, the president of necessity will have to exercise it in large part through his central administrative staff. This relationship is incorporated in the administrative organization of the college. The Faculty Handbook states that the Academic Vice President

> Is the President's principal consultant on educational policy and academic personnel matters, is responsible for academic planning, and is the principal officer

> responsible for the development, quality, and evaluation of the instructional program.

The Academic Vice President has the responsibility of advising the President on recommendations transmitted to him from various school and college committees.

The Executive Vice President is the President's principal consultant on policy and administration of noninstructional activities and instructional services.

Most of the respondents who discussed the functions and performance of the central administrators stated that they have played a facilitating role, but that in addition they should take more initiative in matters of educational development. It was suggested also that the Vice Presidents should take a much more active part in reducing faculty polarization by encouraging civil discourse, and especially by bringing together the members of the faculty factions who are able to work together constructively. An example in point is the agreement worked out for the administrative placement of the Black Studies and La Raza chairs, the Experimental College, and the Educational Opportunity Program. The survey team is convinced that the central administrative staff, especially the Vice Presidents and their associates, working closely with faculty members and administrators of the schools, could play a much more active role in bringing about an accommodation between the major "parties," and in mobilizing the "moderates" as a constructive force in the college.

It is apparent that the President needs at his side associates who are sensitive to the need for educational change and capable of mobilizing the efforts of many individuals and organizations to that end; who are able to work effectively and unperturbedly in the present contentious atmosphere of the college; and who are sympathetic with the President's educational ideals for the institution. Without such a central leadership team, there is little likelihood that the college can be sufficiently unified to become an academically distinguished institution.

While the Vice Presidents of the college need not be faithful copies of the President, they must be in fundamental agreement with his educational and administrative policies. Properly qualified and experienced men will have independent ideas. They will not simply accept the President's direction; they will contribute significantly to educational and administrative policy. In other words, they will be full-fledged members of a working team. To such men, the President will be able to delegate a large degree of discretion and authority. Such associates, in turn, will be capable of exercising discretion and authority in accordance with policies they have helped to form. They will know when to act on their own initiative and responsibility, and when to defer action until they have consulted with the President. These are the relatiosnhips which inspire trust and confidence among those whose activities must be closely articulated. Such relationships should also inspire confidence on the part of other administrators and faculty members in the consistency and integrity of administrative action. The same considerations hold for the Chief Financial Officer.

Dean's Dual Responsibilities

In an institution as large and complex as Fresno State, the central administrators will of necessity share educational leadership with the Deans. But the relationships between the Deans and the President are, by the peculiar status of the deanship, different from the relationships between the President and his Vice Presidents.

Long ago President Eliot of Harvard defined the function of a dean as "the chief adviser of the President concerning the instruction given in his school." But this statement oversimplifies the position of the dean in a day when faculties possess much greater power over educational policy and academic personnel. The dean is the chief medium of communication between the president and the faculty of his school. He is, said an experienced dean, the man in the middle (Wicke, 1963).

The same dean described the relationship between the dean and the president as follows:

> For obvious reasons, therefore, any officer whose major responsibility is primarily the educational function of the institution must be acceptable to both the president and the faculty. The academic dean must construe whatever authority he may have as delegated from president and faculty, even though the president may not share this view.

This writer went on to say that the phrase "man in the middle" precisely designates the dean's function--"to be a potentially creative link between faculty and administration." He added that once the dean moves out of the middle position he is no longer useful, because he now finds it impossible to work with both president and faculty.

In many ways the deanship is the most difficult administrative position in a large college or university. The dean of necessity represents his faculty's views in the central administrative councils. Likewise, he is responsible for presenting as clearly as possible the views of the central administration--or for that matter, the views of college committees--to the school's faculty. If the dean disagrees with the president's views, he is in a difficult position. If he agrees with the president and disagrees with the faculty over an important issue, he also finds himself in a dilemma. The dual accountability of the dean calls for a special style, characterized by openness and integrity. On important issues he may properly decide to make his own position known. In most instances, no doubt, a reconciliation among the views of the central administrators, the school faculty, and the dean is possible. If, on matters of major importance, no such accommodation can be attained, and the dean finds it impossible to work with both president and faculty, he will no longer be effective as a dean.

Nominating Committees. The roles of the Vice Presidents and the Deans, and their relationships with the President, have important implications for the process by which the Vice Presidents and Deans are selected. According to present college regulations, the President is not a member of the consultative committee on the nomination of Vice Presidents and the Chief Financial Officer. The consultative procedures do provide that the selection committee should, in consultation with the appropriate administrator (in this case the President), review the qualifications for the position and insure a thorough canvass for candidates.

The survey team believes that the President should play an active role in the nomination of candidates for the positions of Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. He should be in a position to suggest names for the committee's consideration, and he should take part in reviewing the qualifications of the candidates. The team considers that the President's remoteness from the nomination of persons who will work intimately with him is a basic lapse in the general practice of joint faculty-administrative participation in decision making in the college. Therefore, the survey team recommends that the President be made a member ex officio, without vote, of the consultative committee for the nomination of Vice Presidents. The actual nominations should be by action of the voting members of the committee.

The President or other appropriate administrator should serve in the same capacity when candidates for other central administrative offices are being considered.

The regulations concerning the nomination of a school dean state explicitly that administrators above the school level are excluded from the nominating committee. The survey team believes that this exclusion is inappropriate and inconsistent with the general policy of faculty-administrative participation. As pointed out above, the dean has a dual responsibility, on the one hand to the faculty of his school, and on the other to the President of the college. It is essential, therefore, that the dean should be fully acceptable both to the President and to the faculty. This is much more likely to be the case, it seems to the survey team, if the President or his representative participates in the search for candidates and in the evaluation of their qualifications. Therefore, the survey team recommends that the President or his representative should serve as a member, ex officio, without vote, on the selection committee. It also recommends that the formal nominations should be made by the voting members of the committee. The main point is that the candidates should be jointly considered by the President and the faculty members on the selection committee.

In case of the nomination of a Vice President, the consultative procedures provide that the selection committee should forward to the appointing officer a decisional recommendation, consisting of one or more names. In the case of the nomination of a school dean, the procedures state that the selection committee shall make a nomination or nominations for the position. The survey team believes that it is inappropriate for a selection committee to make a single nomination unless, through joint consideration of candidates by the administrator and the faculty members on the selection committee, both parties agree on a single candidate. The survey team therefore recommends that the procedures be amended to provide that selection committees for central administrators and school deans shall make at least three nominations to the appointing officer unless the latter agrees in advance of formal action that a single nomination is acceptable. This recommendation would seem to be consistent with the general principle of joint participation in decision making ordinarily reflected in the consultative procedures.

CENTRALIZATION AND DECENTRALIZATION IN DECISION MAKING

The report has emphasized the importance of a master plan for development shaped around clearly defined and widely accepted goals. It has asked both faculty committees and administrators to turn the eyes of the college to the future and to keep the institution steadily on course. There is a strong trend in the college toward decentralization in decision making. Accepting the importance of institutional integrity, how can segmental initiative and responsibility be reconciled with the need for symmetrical institutional growth?

In any complex organization, a decision usually passes through a number of levels before becoming final. If one level initiates a recommendation, one or more successive levels may have the authority to make a substantive review of the proposal. Such higher authority is exercised on the assumption that there is a need to coordinate the functions of sub-units of the organization. Organizational authority is highly centralized if each proposal has to reach the "highest" level for final decision.

Decisions initiated at one level, however, may be accepted routinely at successive points. In such circumstances, the "effective" decision is made at the original level in spite of the fact that the final formal authority lies elsewhere. Organizational authority is highly decentralized if recommendations are approved routinely at each higher level.

The Consultative Procedures documents, policy statements, the Assembly Constitution, and the Senate Bylaws set forth the respective roles of departments and schools, and specify the decision-making processes at successive levels.

An examination of the documents and the interviews indicates that in practice a substantial amount of decentralization in decision making exists either by deliberate intent or by the unintended or unforeseen effect of particular decisions.

Decentralization Practices

The degree of decentralization may differ between the faculty committee system and the administrative structure. After examining the patterns of committee and administrative decisions, the survey team reached the following conclusions respecting decentralization:

1. Curriculum. Respondents reported that the faculties of most departments have "effective" control over courses. This decentralization of faculty responsibility began with the phasing out of the College Curriculum Committee several years ago, an action that ended faculty review at the college level. Each school has either a standing curriculum committee or a curriculum subcommittee. Some of the respondents indicated that their school committees made a substantive review of course proposals, but others described the review at the school level as pro forma. Administrative review occurs at both school and college levels. The Dean is involved early in the deliberations of the smaller schools, and in all schools has the responsibility, "after due consultation," of forwarding proposals to the Academic Vice President. The administrative review of courses at the college level is reported to be concerned for the most part with considerations of budget and staffing. Although final formal decisions on courses are made by the Academic Vice President, these actions are, for the most part, essentially pro forma.

2. Educational Policy. Deliberate decisions on educational policy are made at the school and college levels with participation by both the faculty and the administration. It should be recognized, however, that significant educational policy can evolve from

an accumulation of decisions made at the departmental level. One respondent indicated that his department had consciously determined the direction in which it wished to develop and had put this decision into effect through curricular development and staffing patterns. The survey team did not find any provision for review of such an important decision by any faculty committee at either school or college level.

From a study of the documents and the interviews, the extent to which the schools play a major or consistent role in the development of educational policy is not clear to the survey team. The documents of several schools designate a special committee charged with making recommendations for new educational programs or for structural changes, subject to approval by the school's consultative body. Certainly the interviews indicated that some schools did formulate educational policy. For example, the School of Arts and Sciences approves new majors before transmitting them to the AP and P Committee. Recently, the School of Agriculture began a reexamination of its own goals and a general review of its courses and departmental organization. If it chose, the School of Agriculture could change its direction substantially by adding or dropping courses without faculty review at a higher level. However, when the school renamed a department, it submitted the matter to the AP and P Committee for approval because of possible implications for departments in other schools.

At the college level, recommendations on educational policy are primarily the responsibility of the AP and P Committee. Members of the central administration who are ex officio members of this Committee take part in the decisions on educational policy. The central administration takes final action on these recommendations, which may include the establishment of a new major, a program for the master's degree, or a new school.

3. Academic Personnel. In personnel matters the decentralization of faculty participation in decision making has proceeded apace. The departments have "effective" control of appointments without a higher level of faculty review. With the possible exception of departments in one or two schools, in which there may be faculty review, the consultative body of the department sends decisional recommendations on retention and tenure via the administrative route to the College Personnel Committee, where the review is primarily procedural, although there have been a few instances in which departmental recommendations have not been approved. Where promotions are concerned, the department's recommendations are subject to substantive review by the school committee. This committee makes the "effective" faculty decision on rank order for promotions; the college committee is limited to establishing a cut-off point. The respondents stated that the trend in recent years has been toward decentralization to the departmental level of decisions on appointment, retention, and tenure. Most of the interviewees applauded this development.

   Administrative review of personnel recommendations occurs at both school and college levels. The Deans review recommendations on appointment, retention, and tenure, and participate in making recommendations on promotion. The documents and the interviews indicate that the influence exercised by the Deans varies among the schools. At the college level, although the President makes the final decisions, he has reversed very few departmental recommendations on personnel.

4. *Budget*. As the discussion in the Committee section of this report indicated, the survey team found that the Budget Committee has not yet assumed all the functions assigned to it in the Senate Bylaws. The regulations of the Chancellor's office set limits within which the central administration and the Deans decide on the allocation of both instructional and noninstructional funds. The participation of faculty committees in these decisions at either the school or college level is by no means as great as it is in many other matters, although it is greater in some schools than in others.
5. *Summary of Present Practice*. Effective decisions on *courses* are made at the department or school level, with only administrative review at college level. Educational *policy* is primarily the responsibility of of college committees, although within their own provinces schools also make policy decisions. Except for promotions, which are given substantive review at the school level, personnel decisions in effect are made at the departmental level because most receive no school review, and because they are usually given what is an essentially procedural review by the college committee. Deans and central administrators also review personnel decisions.

Consequences of Extreme Decentralization

The survey team believes that decentralization has taken place too quickly at Fresno State College and has gone too far. During the relatively short period in which the present faculty Constitution has been in effect, decentralization has developed rapidly, particularly in matters of personnel and curriculum. The rapidity with which this has occurred may have been in part a reaction against the restraints of an earlier administration during which there probably was much less faculty participation in decision making at all levels of the organization. While this reaction may be understandable, it is important to recognize that decentralization, when carried to an extreme, results in educational fragmentation and disintegration. The possible consequences of decentralization carried to this end are these:

1. The college could lose any real sense of being an intellectual community. It could find it difficult to establish clear institutional goals and to articulate a guiding educational philosophy.
2. The college could suffer departmental imbalance resulting in a disruption of functional relationships among disciplines and a distortion of the learning experience of students.
3. Liberal and professional education could develop separately rather than interdependently. The functional relationships between professional curricula and the basic disciplines on which the former rest could be lost.
4. By abandoning in effect a program of general education, the college could lose an element which should help to unify an intellectual community and to integrate students' educational experiences.
5. By unwisely dispersing scarce human and financial resources (which will probably only become scarcer), the college could court academic mediocrity, or compromise its present educational integrity or its future role in a developing system of higher education in California.

Fresno State has not reached the stage of extreme decentralization, but it has gone far in that direction. This is particularly true so far as faculty review is concerned. In its study of the College Personnel Committee and of the College BORAP, the survey team was struck by the diminished role of college faculty committees in substantively reviewing departmental recommendations. It also noted the lack of uniform provisions for school faculty review of some personnel matters. The faculty of the college should take no further steps toward decentralization until it makes a careful study of the present and probable future consequences of the measures it has already taken in that direction. The survey team believes that the faculty of the college should reassert its prerogative of substantive review of important departmental and school recommendations.

Review by Faculty and Administration

Fresno State has been wise to provide for joint faculty and administrative membership in committees, but, as has been pointed out, only administrative review occurs at the higher levels for certain kinds of decisions.

The effect of higher review may vary, depending on whether it is done by a committee consisting of both faculty and administrators or by administrators alone. Joint committee review encourages both faculty and administrators to examine the relationships of the part to the whole. Thus, during consideration of a course proposal, the faculty members should study such matters as the relationship of the course to existing courses and majors, to the general education program, and to adequacy of library resources. Because the administrator's views should encompass the broad educational scene as well as special knowledge of such matters as budget, his participation is as necessary as that of the faculty members. In committee deliberation, a great deal of mutual education occurs, and there is at least an opportunity for a consistent educational philosophy to emerge. If a departmental proposal is reviewed only by administrators at school and college levels, the educational effect of full discussion is lost for both faculty members and administrators. Moreover, if a central administrator should veto a departmental proposal without joint faculty-administrative consideration, the suspicion that many faculty members have of all administrators and, in particular, those furthest removed from them, could be aggravated.

Dispersion of Decision Making

Some dispersion of decision making is necessary, of course. Some of the principles which should govern this dispersion are as follows: "Effective" decision making should take place as near to the operating unit as possible, subject to wider and controlling policy at school and college levels. Thus, the schools should review departmental actions, and the college should review school decisions. Finally, review at school and college levels should include both faculty and administration. Final review is the President's responsibility. As emphasized repeatedly in this report, dispersion of decision making cannot proceed with integrity without a long-range plan for the educational development of the college. Such a plan provides a context and rationale for decisions at points of origin. If these decisions are consistent with wider school and college policy, they are unlikely to be overturned at higher levels. Fresno State is seriously handicapped because it possesses no such controlling plan of development.

Recommendations

1. The survey team recommends that the rapid decentralization of faculty review should be halted. The team believes that the faculty should participate in substantive review at successive levels instead of leaving this function to administrators alone.

2. Because of their special knowledge, departments should continue to exercise their responsibility for initiative with respect to curriculum and personnel, but their recommendations should be subject to review by school committees in the light of established educational policy. This may mean that in some instances school committees will need to be strengthened.
3. College committees should also maintain the functional integrity of the institution by making a substantive review of the recommendations which reach them.
    - a. As pointed out previously, the AP and P Committee should continue to exercise full review of recommendations on educational policy and assume greater initiative in the development of educational strategy.
    - b. Departmental curricular proposals, which the AP and P Committee no longer considers, should receive substantive review at the college level. If a college-wide course committee is not reestablished, the office of the Academic Vice President should acquire the staff necessary to make a substantive rather than mainly pro forma review of course proposals.
    - c. The College Personnel Committee should give substantive review to all the personnel recommendations it receives.

CONSULTATIVE PROCEDURES

The formal procedures which systematize the processes of joint faculty-administrative participation in decision making are set forth in the Faculty Hand-Book and in other documents. The Faculty Handbook lists the basic premises of the consultative procedures as follows:

1. The ultimate purpose of consultative procedures shall be to guarantee full participation by faculty and academic administrators in the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the administrative and academic environment.
2. The appropriate consultative body shall be consulted on the manner in which it wishes to be consulted in the formulation of policy and the development of administering procedures.
3. Any member of the consultative body, tenured or nontenured, regardless of term of service or terminal status, may request a hearing from the appropriate agency of appeal if he believes that consultative procedures have been violated in the development of any policy, recommendation, or procedure [p. 7].

Joint Responsibility

The Handbook goes on to define the consultative bodies for the college, the schools, and the departments. These provisions are readily available and need not be repeated here. It should be said, however, that at each level there is an administrator and a consultative body, and at all levels policy formation is deemed to be the joint responsibility of the administrator and the consultative bodies. However, according to the Faculty Handbook, decisions made under policies jointly determined ". . .are the responsibility of the administrative officers of the College, Schools, or Departments [p. 6]." This is a rather vague statement which presumably means that a major responsibility of administrators is to execute the policies which have been decided upon ". . .in accordance with appropriate consultative procedures. . . ."

Framework for Consultation. The Handbook sets forth a set of complicated guidelines as a framework within which consultation should take place and within which decisions should be made and transmitted.

The first step in determining how to manage a particular problem is to determine ". . .the level of levels of the administrative and consultative framework concerned with or involved in the resolution. . ." of the matter. (Who shall make the determination is not stated.) In the case of a particular class of decisions to be discussed later, it is essential to determine when a subordinate level has major, but not final, responsibility for the decision. In any case, according to the Handbook, "An administrative officer or a consultative body. . .at either the College, School, or Department level charged with the responsibility and authority for making the decision on the matter shall be designated [p. 9]."

The distinction between those recommendations or decisions which may be made by consultative bodies and those to be made by administrators is, according to the present procedures, a major consideration.

Types of Action. The Handbook defines the types of action which may be taken as follows:

1. Recommendations incorporate the majority views of the consultative body. These are transmitted to the administrator at that level, to be forwarded with a statement of minority views. If the administrator disagrees with his consultative body, he must present his views to that body in advance of transmitting his and the consultative body's recommendations to the next level. If the disagreement cannot be resolved, the administrator is directed to forward all statements, including his dissenting opinion, and to present the consultative body with a written copy of his dissent.
2. A decisional recommendation is the type of action in which a recommendation is forwarded

to higher levels, but which, if not approved by the administrator or consultative body responsible for the decision, must be referred back to the recommending body for further consideration. A decisional recommendation cannot be amended at the higher level until a) it has been referred back to the originating body, b) that body has refused to change its recommendation, and c) the matter is of such importance that, in the opinion of the President or his representative, orderly administration of the college or of any school or department cannot proceed until the issue is resolved.

3. Policy decisions, which are to be arrived at in accordance with the Faculty Assembly Constitution, are made jointly by consultative bodies and administrators of schools or departments; these decisions become policy when announced by the administrator at the level in question. In cases in which the administrator and the consultative body cannot agree on a policy decision, the matter is to be referred to the administrative officer or faculty committee at the next higher level for mediation and possible adjudication. The Handbook provides that the question to whom the appeal shall be made is a policy decision at the higher level.
4. Administrative decisions can be made when there is no policy to the contrary. However, the consultative body at the level of the decision, by procedures which it is directed to establish, may question the correctness of the administrator's determination. If such a question is raised, the matter shall be treated as one for a policy decision.

A committee of the Academic Senate is charged with the responsibility of reviewing questions concerning consultative

> procedures, including the claim that these procedures have been violated. A school or department, through its consultative body, may also assign the power of review of consultative procedures to a committee. By a policy decision, the college or school is directed to establish procedures for substantive review of appeals of policy decisions made at the respective level [pp. 9-11].

Review of Documents. The next sections, "Deficiencies in the documents" and "Interviewees' opinions about consultative procedures," reflect both the survey team's appraisal of the stated consultative procedures and the opinions of the persons interviewed concerning their adequacy. The team attempted to make a thorough analysis of the documents, and it reached an independent judgment of their strengths and deficiencies. In the course of its interviews, however, the team uncovered a range of opinions on the contents and use of the documents.

Deficiencies in the documents.

1. Other sections of this report have referred to specific ambiguities or omissions in the documents. In discussing the Executive Committee, for example, the survey team pointed out that the documents are ambiguous on whether the recommendations of Senate and college committees become the policy of the Academic Senate within 20 instructional days *after submission to the Executive Committee, as stated in the Constitution, or after submission to the Academic Senate, as stated in the Bylaws*.
2. Certain respondents told the survey team that some faculty members and administrators had difficulty with the Consultative Procedures documents because "they didn't do their homework." The survey team

submits that it takes no small amount of study to identify the relevant passages from document to document and to understand them. The team found it a difficult task to collate and organize just the provisions relating to actions which require decisional recommendations as distinct from other kinds of recommendations. In some matters, the BORAP procedures--for example, the classes of decisions at department, school, and college levels--are quite clearly organized and specified. In other matters, such as those relating to the development of academic policies, the decisional processes are not so clearly organized and specified. While persons who are intimately involved in faculty government may claim to know the exact procedures to be followed in every matter, those procedures are not clearly organized and codified so that everyone can immediately locate the appropriate ones for any given situation.

3. Another major source of difficulty in the interpretation of the documents is ambiguity in the description of how "determinations" are made. In the language of the _Faculty Handbook_ a determination shall be made as follows:
   a. The level or levels of the administrative and consultative framework concerned with or involved in the resolution of a matter shall be determined.
   b. An administrative officer or a consultative body (or its duly constituted representatives) at either the College, School, or Department level charged with the responsibility and authority for making the decision on the matter shall be designated. Until an administrative officer or consultative body is so designated, the matter shall be submitted to the President or to the Vice

> President designated by the President, as a 'Recommendation' /p. 9/.

These passages and other documents stop short of supplying the reader with the important information on exactly how or by whom determinations are made.

In summary, the Consultative Procedures documents are sometimes ambiguous; the relevant passages from the several documents have not been usefully codified; the procedures are in some regards defective; and the method for reaching determinations is not clearly specified.

Interviewees' Opinions about Consultative Procedures. The survey team uncovered a wide range or opinions about the substance and use of the present set of Consultative Procedures documents. Some of these attitudes are summarized below.

1. A few respondents advocated a complete renovation of the existing consultative procedures. These persons declared that the present procedures are so legalistic, elaborate, and cumbersome that large amounts of time and effort are wasted in bickering about their interpretation.
2. Another view, the most prevalent one, was that the consultative procedures, while sound in principle, need revision and/or streamlining. The most common complaints by the proponents of this position were that a) too much time is wasted in procedural wrangles rather than in substantive debate, b) the documents are ambiguous in some aspects, c) the procedures themselves are too complex, and d) some people try to use the consultative procedures as a weapon and often inflame small issues into great controversies through charges of circumvention of the documents or through political manipulation.
3. Finally, a third group of respondents felt that the present consultative procedures are

> clearly written and constitute a satisfactory basis for faculty participation in decision making. Many members of this group felt that it is because most people do not read the documents carefully enough, and do not follow the consultative procedures faithfully, that disputes over proper procedures occur. These respondents cited the long history of poor faculty-administrative relations at the college which eventually culminated in the academic reorganization of March 1966. At least some of those most intimately involved in the composition of the documents pointed out that it was imperative to redress what they considered to be improper administrative control over matters which should be decided jointly, and to provide structural assurances that such an imbalance would not recur. Presumably, they believe that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

The opinions of the respondents about the present regulations for formal consultation range from the attitude that the procedures should be completely renovated to the feeling that they are fully adequate. The prevalent view was that the documents are basically sound but that they need systematic codification and careful revision.

Conclusions

Against a background of distrust and faculty-administrative tension, what in many institutions is accomplished through mutual understanding, and often through informal relationships, has at Fresno become highly formal and doctrinaire. The distinctions among decisional recommendations, recommendations, and other types of actions, for example, are more complicated, legalistic, and rigid than either the statutory procedures or the informal practices of joint decision making in other academic institutions with which the members of the survey team are familiar. The team believes that many of the difficulties in carrying out both the letter and the spirit of the documents on consultation, some of which have been discussed above, center around the problem of classifying decisions. The team also believes that the formal use of decisional recommendations has much to do with inducing a psychology of confrontation between faculty and administration.

Adequate Consultation Imperative. The team states emphatically that full, two-way consultation between faculty bodies and administrators is imperative. Such consultation is embodied in the spirit and the language of the Constitution of the Academic Assembly and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. The members of the team concur fully with the basic premise of the present consultative procedures, which requires full participation by faculty and academic administrators in the formulation of policy and procedures affecting administrative and academic affairs.

In an institution with the standing of Fresno State College, arbitrary administrative action is obviously unacceptable. Constitutional documents properly require the President to consult the faculty on all matters of academic policy, and the spirit, if not the letter, of these documents requires the President to consult on all other matters which significantly affect the members of the institution. What is required of the President should be required of all other administrators. What is required of administrators should be required of the faculty as well. If either of these parties finds the other derelict in its duty to consult, it should call the negligent partner to account. The obligation for consultation, of course, is not only between faculty and administration. College faculty committees bear responsibility for consultation among themselves and with appropriate committees at lower levels. Alert faculty bodies will make certain that this consultation takes place.

The survey team believes that the requirements concerning consultation listed in the Faculty Handbook under the simple classification of "Recommendation [p. 9]" should be faithfully followed. Consultative bodies should be given reasonable time to deliberate and to formulate recommendations. The right of dissent should be scrupulously protected, and dissenting views, whether of faculty members or administrators, should be fully reported. Neither faculty bodies nor administrators who have the responsibility and authority for review at levels higher than the one at which recommendations or policies originated should disapprove of these recommendations without full consultation with the administrators or faculty bodies which transmitted them. Again, if any one of these agents is derelict at any point in the process, he should be held accountable. Furthermore, any individual member of the faculty should have access under appropriate procedures to any decision-making body or officer whose acts bear on his academic or his personal interests.

Information is not equivalent to consultation. If the appropriate body of the Academic Senate is required to consult with the President on the membership of major college committees, simply informing him of the nominations that the committee expects to make to the Senate does not constitute consultation. Likewise, for the President, or other administrators, simply informing a consultative body that he finds its recommendation unacceptable does not satisfy the requirement of consultation. A capable administrator will convey his points of view, or his reasons, to a consultative body in the process of attempting to resolve differences and to arrive at constructive proposals which both parties can support. This report has already pointed out that when all parties are jointly involved in the early stages of decision making, administrative vetoes will occur only in the most extraordinary circumstances. This is not to say that final administrative disapproval will never occur. It is to say that it should not occur without thorough consultation.

Formal consultation and formal decision making may often be facilitated by informal communication. This report has already stressed the importance of informal relationships, but it should be noted, too, that it has pointed out that when decisions are made, the formal lines of communication and authority should be scrupulously followed. This report has also emphasized that there should be adequate formal means of hearing individual faculty grievances against either administrative or faculty authority. Institutions which adhere to the general principles embodied in this report will have adopted adequate grievance procedures, coupled with designated avenues of appeal.

Recommendations

1. The survey team believes that commitment of all parties to the consultative relationships described above will now enable the college to simplify and clarify its consultative procedures. To that end, the survey team recommends that the college should drop the distinctions made in the Consultative Procedures document (Faculty Handbook, pp. 9-11) among decisional recommendations, recommendations, policy decisions, and administrative decisions, and that all matters referred from one level to another be treated as recommendations. The team recommends, further, that faculty bodies and administrators hold each other responsible for thorough consultation during the process of arriving at recommendations and during the processes of faculty and administrative review of such recommendations.
2. The survey team recommends that the personnel grievance procedures should be retained as protection against either arbitrary administrative or arbitrary faculty action. Clearly codified and fully agreed upon procedures are essential when personal and professional as well as institutional interests are at stake.
3. The college should abandon the 20-day rule for action on the recommendations of certain

committees. Fixed deadlines can be destructive of adequate consultation and debate, especially on matters of far-reaching significance. When committee reports go directly to the Senate floor, as the survey team has recommended, fixed deadlines for action may curtail deliberation. This need not prohibit rapid action on urgent matters since they can be brought to a vote any time the deliberative body desires. If faculty committees or administrators are suspected of unnecessary or deliberate delay, the appropriate bodies or individuals should press for action. One means of avoiding delaying tactics would be to have the chairmen of major committees systematically check the status of each of their recommendations. If the Academic Senate desired, this task could be undertaken by the Executive Committee in the performance of its duties as an expediting and coordinating agency.

4. After the several classes of decisions and recommendations are dropped, the Consultative Procedures Committee should codify for ready reference the accepted practices and policies for faculty-administrative consultation at various levels. This catalogue should be updated as frequently as necessary.
5. As a further check on unacceptable administrative performance and as another measure of administrative accountability, Vice Presidents and Deans should be appointed for stated terms, such as five years; their performance should be evaluated during the last year of their term in office; and their acceptability for reappointment determined jointly by a committee composed of faculty members and administrators. Periodic appraisal of administrative performance is rapidly becoming the practice in democratically organized colleges and universities.

The report turns now from the formal arrangements for consultation to a malaise of spirit and style that endangers the integrity of the college.

POLARIZATION

The faculty of the college is split by two opposing factions. These contending groups are known locally by various names--a common characterization is "conservatives" and "liberals," not very descriptive terms, but ones which may be used for practical purposes.

The survey team does not know how rigid the division is, but infers that the lines are hardening. If the polarization is in fact so rigid that the votes on any issue can be predicted accurately in advance, it will be increasingly difficult to arrive at considered judgments on significant questions of college policy.

Interviewees reported a number of issues around which polarization occurs. One is the question of faculty versus administrative authority. Another is decentralized control versus college-wide review of recommendations and decisions by departments and schools. These are fundamental problems of governance, and they deserve the most thoughtful analysis and debate.

However, comments by interview subjects induce the impression that some of the basic issues have been obscured in what has now become a struggle for power between the conservatives and liberals. At times, power seems to have become an end in itself or, at any rate, the means by which the present dissidents hope to take control and, in turn, impose their will, or the means by which the conservatives seek to maintain their present dominance.

The faculty is not only polarized; it is also highly politicized. As one respondent put it, "At times we become so political that we forget the educational mission of the College." Two arenas are the Academic Senate and open meetings of Senate and college committees. The methods are not only the usual political ones like caucusing and getting out the votes. They also include on occasion such devices as organizing pressure groups to attend open committee sessions. What are normally occasions for relatively unemotional decision making are often magnified into major controversies.

In the midst of this controversy, the two parties attempt to find recruits among new faculty members. One newcomer said that the process goes through three stages: 1) exploration of ideas and attitudes, 2) manipulation, and 3) full membership. It is normal, one assumes, to look for allies. But when newcomers are asked early to choose sides or are co-opted into a tightly knit faction, they are introduced to the divisiveness of the faculty, rather than to the central problems of educational purpose, college character, and institutional development. If it were widespread, this partisan enlistment could be destructive of individual morale, and inimical to a sense of community and common purpose.

One of the more unhappy phases of the conflict is that a few persons on both sides have become so personally and emotionally involved that their words and manners have served to heighten tensions. In extreme circumstances, individuals have resorted to invective. Fortunately, the number who have done so is very small.

Vituperation poisons the atmosphere and obstructs rational debate. Distrust between individuals and faculty groups, and between faculty and administration, which many interviewees said is much too widespread, undermines respect for persons and ideas, brings motives into question, discourages frank exchange of views, and subverts the purposes which the academic decision-making processes at Fresno State were presumably designed to serve. If this is the atmosphere which characterizes the college, or is the climate toward which it is rapidly moving, one is hard put to avoid the pessimism which led an observer of the academic scene to say recently:

> We seem destined, in short, to move increasingly toward relationships of an adversary type, characterized by confrontation and bargaining, backed by force, by threat, and intimidation /Livingston, pp. 170-171/.

These relationships seem to characterize an increasing number of institutions. One hopes that Fresno State has not gone that far. But it may easily reach that end unless it quickly changes direction.

The survey team does not envisage a bland academic community. Controversy is inevitable in the modern college and university, which are exposed to many external pressures and are instrumental to a wide range of social needs, and are subject, as well, to the competition of internal interests. Furthermore, controversy, if it is responsibly resolved, may stimulate growth. At a fundamental level, this controversy is about the goals of the college or university, and the order of priority of the purposes to be served [Foster, pp. 49, 435-443].

Conflict over goals gives the institution a basic political character. When this report speaks critically of politicization at Fresno, it does not mean to imply that politics, broadly conceived, has no place in the college. It means to say that the college should stop to think about how political issues--that is to say, issues of educational purpose and value--should be debated, negotiated, or resolved.

> There are many organizations where politics is played, and played with great dedication and Machiavellian skill,' a writer on university governance said recently; 'this is the politics of ambition and personal power. . . . [Ibid]

As pointed out above, when power becomes an end in itself, when personal conflict obscures the important issues, when devious maneuvering supplants forthright debate according to established rules, a college is about to lose its integrity as an *academic political society*. In the considered judgment of the survey team, the integrity of Fresno State College is at stake.

What can faculty members and administrators do to redress the divisiveness, contention, and distrust? In the judgment of the survey team, the solution is neither to resort to administrative authority nor to accept control by a faculty coterie. The way out is to restore the rule of rationality.

Waldo (1968), an authority in the field of public administration, turning recently to the problem of university governance, pointed out that the university is an unstable and vulnerable organization because it does not posses an overriding, accepted principle of authority. "Or perhaps," he wrote, "there is an overriding principle: the principle of reasonableness, together with the democratic norm that, after reason and with reason, the majority will prevail. . . ."

The return to analysis, dialogue, debate, and, we hope, rationality for the resolution of conflict will occur only if certain considerations are observed. First, reasoning depends on a style of communication best characterized, perhaps, as civility. Vigorous as reasoned discussion may be, personal attacks or ill-considered charges of faculty or administrative culpability should be avoided, as they serve only to aggravate divisiveness and to forestall the intelligent solution of controversial problems.

Second, the policy of joint participation by faculty and administration in decision making, which is built into the articles and documents of governance for the college (with revisions recommended in this report), should be sincerely and fully followed. Perhaps one test of the sincerity of joint deliberation and action would be less debate over legalisms and more observance of the spirit of two-way communication and collaboration. If all sides were moved by this spirit, they would find few occasions for confrontation and recrimination. Several of our respondents emphasized that formal consultation is almost as much a matter of style as it is of legality.

Third, some of our respondents have said that the central administrators, especially the President and the Vice Presidents, should play a more active role in unifying the college. As emphasized earlier in the report, they should raise questions of purpose and of relevant means of attaining the institution's goals. They should keep the interests of the institution and the quality of students' educational experience at the center of discussion and planning. There is little reason to expect that the self-interests of departments and schools, or of faculties and deans, will add up to a coherent educational program. The President and the Vice Presidents should articulate the paramount interests of the college as they and the consultative bodies make day-by-day decisions.

Fourth, as long as extreme polarization exists, a third force should be encouraged to play a moderating role. Several respondents reported that such a moderate group without partisan commitment does exist, and that its members move in one direction or the other on particular issues. The interviewees do not know how large this moderate force is. Some respondents feared that this group might withdraw from an arena characterized by pressure, bitterness, and invective. It would be unfortunate if this happened. All sincerely interested in the future of the college should do everything possible to stimulate widespread faculty participation in discussions of institutional policy. Responsible faculty leaders should make a determined effort to assure a hearing for all points of view. This report has already proposed that major committees should reflect a range of views, and therefore should not be composed of members of a single "party."

Finally, if the few whose manner creates tensions voluntarily retired from the contest, other persons, whatever their differences of opinion, might succeed in making deliberative and consultative bodies into productive policy-making instruments.

The survey team believes that the trend in personal and professional relationships toward even more destructive conflict is not irreversible. But it also believes that all those who have the welfare of the college deeply at heart should lead the return to those governmental processes which emphasize the intellectual values of the institution.

As a member of the survey team (Stull, 1963) wrote some time ago, the spirit required is

> . . .willingness to listen together with the desire to understand, the courage to

> ask pertinent questions, and the decency to give reasoned answers. These qualities grow only with use. No reorganization can supply them. With luck and persistence, a system can sometimes be found that will make it easier for them to appear /pp. 71-81/.

Conclusions

The basis for joint faculty-administrative participation in decision making was established in the Constitution of the Academic Assembly, the Bylaws of the Academic Senate, and the regulations for consultative procedures which were subsequently adopted. The survey team fully supports the basic premise governing the relationships of faculty and administration, as stated in the Faculty Handbook:

> The ultimate purpose of consultative procedures shall be to guarantee full participation by faculty and academic administrators in the formulation of policies and procedures affecting the administrative and academic environment /p. 7/.

The survey team concurs in the judgment of most of its respondents that administrators should become involved in deliberations on important matters at early stages, and participate throughout the decision-making process. (The stage at which administrative participation occurs may vary with the matter under consideration and with the level at which it originates.)

With few exceptions, the survey team's respondents accepted the importance of educational leadership by major administrators, and some respondents asked for more active initiative from the President and other central administrators. In asking for more administrative leadership, these respondents did not seek administrative direction or arbitrary authority. The leader's primary task is to mobilize the members of an organization toward the attainment of goals which all participants have had a share in defining.

Leadership in an academic institution proceeds in great part through the effective use of formal methods of consultation and participation. It also depends to a high degree on informal, face-to-face relationships. Only by putting aside the operational details which often monopolize their time can administrators participate in the informal interchange of ideas which should characterize an intellectual environment.

The survey team has pointed out that the President and his immediate administrative associates should comprise a working team in which all of the members actively contribute to the discussion of substantive educational and administrative questions. To such qualified associates, a President should delegate a large degree of discretion and authority, with the expectation that they will act in accordance with policies which they have helped to form.

The survey team believes that the President should take an active part in the nomination of candidates for the positions of Vice President and Chief Financial Officer. To that end, it recommends that the President be made a member, ex officio, without vote, of the consultative committee for the nomination should be made by action of the voting members of the committee.

The President must not only share leadership with his immediate administrative associates; he must share it with the Deans. However, the Deans have a special relationship with the President. An Academic Dean is accountable both to the faculty and to the President. Whatever authority he has is delegated from the President and the faculty. Being "the man in the middle" places the Dean in the difficult position of having to remain acceptable both to the President and to the faculty which he represents.

Since the Dean should be fully acceptable both to the faculty and to the President, the survey team recommends that the President or his representative should serve as a member, ex officio, without vote, on the selection committee. It also recommends, again, that the formal nomination should be made by the voting members of the committee.

The nature of the relationships among the President, the Vice Presidents, the Deans, and the faculties makes it desirable to amend the relevant consultative procedures to require the nominating committees to present at least three nominations, unless the appointing officer agrees in advance of formal action that a single nomination is acceptable.

In the day-by-day process of decision making by faculty bodies and administrators, the college has rapidly moved toward decentralization of decision making, especially in matters of curriculum and academic personnel. This is particularly true so far as faculty review of recommendations and decisions is concerned. This trend threatens the educational integrity of the college, especially since there is no long-range plan for development against which proposals for curriculum, educational policy, and faculty recruitment can be measured. Furthermore, decentralization may easily lead to the uneconomic use of scarce human and financial resources and condemn the college to academic mediocrity. To what extent decentralization at Fresno State has been the product of deliberate design, on the one hand, or of inadvertence, on the other, the survey team is unable to say. In any event, it believes that decentralization has been carried too far. Therefore, it recommends that 1) the rapid decentralization of faculty review should be halted; 2) departments should continue to exercise their responsibility for initiative with respect to curriculum and faculty personnel, but their recommendations should be reviewed by school committees in the light of established educational policy; 3) college committees also should protect and advance the functional integrity of the institution by making substantial reviews of the recommendations which reach them; and 4) if a college-wide course committee is not reinstated, the office of the Academic Vice President should make a substantive rather than pro forma review of course proposals.

The survey team made a careful analysis of the documents governing consultative procedures. In brief, it found that the documents are sometimes ambiguous, that the relevant provisions from various sources have not been codified, and that the procedures are in some regards defective. In the end, the survey team concurred with the prevalent but not unanimous view of its respondents that the formal procedures need revision. More particularly, the team came to the conclusion that the formal use of "decisional recommendations" has had much to do with the development of a psychology of confrontation between faculty and administration. Nevertheless, the survey team states emphatically that adequate consultation in both directions between faculty bodies and administrators is imperative, and that arbitrary administrative action is unacceptable. If either faculty or administration finds the other derelict in the duty to consult, it should call the negligent partner to account.

The survey team believes that the consultative processes will proceed more smoothly and effectively if one especially technical element of the present consultative system is simplified. To that end, the survey team recommends that the college drop the distinction among decisional recommendations, recommendations, policy decisions, and administrative decisions, and that all matters referred from one level to another be treated as recommendations. It recommends, further, that both faculty bodies and administrators should hold each other responsible for thorough consultation.

The survey team believes that safeguards against either arbitrary administrative, or arbitrary faculty, action are essential. Therefore, it recommends that the personnel grievance procedures should be retained and scrupulously followed when invoked.

As a further check on unacceptable administrative performance and as another measure of administrative accountability, the survey team recommends that Vice Presidents and Deans should be appointed for stated terms, that their performance should be evaluated during the last year of their term of office, and that their acceptability for reappointment should be determined jointly by a committee composed of faculty members and administrators.

No matter how well they are drawn, the structures and forms of governance will not alone suffice to produce an academic community which can constructively resolve its differences over ends and means. The spirit with which the participants use the instruments of governance may be even more important than their structural framework. It is for this reason that the divisiveness and distrust which it found disturbed the survey team. The faculty is polarized and politicized, and there is more than a suggestion of factional struggles for power. In the team's judgment, the most pressing problem which the college faces is that of turning a society rent by factionalism into an academic political community democratically governed by the rule of reason.

IV

Summary

No detailed summary of recommendations and conclusions needs to be appended here. Such summaries may be found on pages 48, 49 and 50 of Chapter II and pages 91 to 95 of Chapter III. The survey team wishes only to add a final comment.

Fresno State College is to be commended for having devised a comprehensive system of internal governance. Likewise President Frederic W. Ness merits praise for having accepted this system soon after taking office--accepted it, the survey team believes, in good faith.

Although the Constitution of the Academic Assembly and the Bylaws of the Academic Senate may have been written after a period of distrust and tension between faculty and administration, these documents straightforwardly incorporate the principle of joint faculty-administrative decision making. The Constitution and Bylaws were written with the sound intention of according the faculty a large role in deciding, within the constraints of the state college system, most, if not all, significant aspects of internal college policy. For example, the Constitution of the Academic Assembly delegates to the faculty the ". . . responsibility and authority to develop and recommend policies. . ." and declares that the faculty ". . . should be consulted on all academic policy matters by the President of the College."

The college has also established means of protection against arbitrary administrative action, as every system of college and university governance should. For example, an Interim Document established procedures for handling individual grievances. This document as presented in the Faculty Handbook, provides that

> Every faculty member has the right to a full and impartial hearing of an alleged grievance, a prompt decision at the department, division, or school level, and appeal for review in accordance with established procedures [p. 111].

Full consultation is another means of defense against the abuse of administrative authority. The survey team has declared that such consultation between faculty and administration is imperative in reaching decisions on all important matters of policy and action. It has proposed that if either of these parties finds the other derelict in its duty to consult, it should call the negligent partner to account.

As still another form of protection against arbitrary administrative action, the team recommends that the performance of Vice Presidents and Deans should be evaluated periodically, and their acceptability for reappointment determined.

All these are important and necessary formal measures of accountability. If the system of governance really works, the several parts of the college community will interchange views informally as well as formally--and not always in one direction.

The survey team found evidence on the campus of a contentious atmosphere that generated strong, although by no means complete, faculty polarization. Although the basic constitutional documents do not seem to be contentious in spirit, the Consultative Procedures documents appear to be based on the adversary principle. The latter documents probably were engendered by the distrust which characterized an earlier period. The team has proposed changes in the documents designed to make them less legalistic and cumbersome, in order to promote responsible consultation at all levels of decision making and administration.

The survey team has suggested a return to civility wherever this is called for, and especially to the principle of rationality in vigorous debate over controversial issues. The process of reaching rational decisions should be coupled with the willingness of all elements of the academic political community to respect actions taken according to the principles of government to which the college committed itself constitutionally.

A return to impersonal, if spirited, debate will enable the college more fully to enjoy other important benefits which its system of governance should confer. One of these values is an open system of decision making. With infrequent exceptions, the major Senate and college committees hold open meetings--so open that they sometimes find it difficult to conduct their business efficiently. The minutes of the Academic Assembly, the Academic Senate, and major committees are widely distributed. The survey team is not as certain that communication from administrators is equally comprehensive and complete. Had it made a more careful survey of formal and informal dissemination of information by administrators, the team might have found a generous amount. The visitors simply observe here that every part of the college should make a determined effort to inform. Even then the lines of communication will occasionally break down, or the participants will fail to read or listen.

The survey team has noted that the President has established an Administrative Council composed of Deans and, on occasion, other administrators and committee chairmen. This kind of lateral communication can aid significantly in holding the college on course--if in fact the course has been charted. The Administrative Council, the survey team was told, is not a body which makes policy decisions, although there is some suspicion on the campus that it does. If he has not already done so, the President should immediately clarify the function of the Council for the college community, and the minutes and reports it generates should be widely distributed.

The survey team concludes that, if all members of the college made a sincere and determined effort to conduct the affairs of the college according to the principles embodied in this report, they could put aside the adversary attitude, plan a distinctive and distinguished future for the institution, and realize these expectations in large measure.

Appendix

TABLE 1

Fresno State College Faculty: Sex and Age by Schools and Departments in Fall 1963 and Fall 1968

Schools and Departments	SEX												AGE			
	Fall 63						Fall 68						Fall 63		Fall 68	
	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	Mean Years	N*	Mean Years
Administration	7	2.0	5	71.4	2	28.6	70	10.7	46	65.7	24	34.3	7	43.6	41	49.8 (Less Librarians)
Administrators (with rank)							12		9		3				12	49.7
Administrators (without rank)							15		14		1				14	55.7
Student Personnel							14		11		3				14	44.1
Medical Office							1		1						1	47.0
Library							28		11		17				28	38.1
School of Agriculture	22	6.3	22				25	3.8	25				22	43.7	25	46.7
Agricultural Mechanics	3		3				4		4				3	41.7	4	43.7
Animal Science	9		9				10		10				9	43.0	10	49.9
Plant Science	9		9				11		11				9	44.6	11	44.9
Farm Manager	1		1										1	48.0		
School of Arts and Sciences	195	55.7	168	86.2	27	13.9	326	49.7	282	86.5	44	13.5	195	42.5	325	40.7
Anthro-Sociology							12		12						12	42.3
Art	9		5		4		18		15		3		9	38.4	17	35.4
Biology	18		16		2		25		21		4		18	44.6	25	43.2
Chemistry	12		12				16		15		1		12	40.6	16	39.2
Economics	5		5				11		10		1		5	44.2	11	35.7
English	18		16		2		28		24		4		18	38.0	28	37.7
Foreign Languages	12		9		3		22		17		5		12	45.7	22	47.2
Geography	5		5				14		14				5	42.4	14	41.5

TABLE 1 (continued)

	SEX												AGE			
	Fall 63						Fall 68						Fall 63		Fall 68	
Schools and Departments	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	Mean Years	N*	Mean Years
School of Arts and Sciences (cont.)																
Geology	5		5				8		8				5	44.8	8	39.9
History	11		9		2		26		23		3		11	42.2	26	40.0
Linguistics							7		7						7	36.3
Math	11		10		1		13		11		2		11	40.9	13	41.8
Music	15		13		2		16		12		4		15	46.9	16	47.0
Philosophy	5		5				8		7		1		5	38.8	8	36.6
Physical Education	24		16		8		33		22		11		24	45.0	33	41.8
Physics	7		7				9		9				7	45.3	9	44.0
Political Science	5		5				11		9		2		5	40.6	11	37.3
Psychology	15		15				16		16				15	40.5	16	40.2
Speech-Arts	18		15		3		32		29		3		18	41.1	32	39.8
Black Studies							1		1						1	33.0
School of Business	26	7.4	21	80.8	5	19.2	54	8.2	49	90.7	5	9.3	26	45.7	53	44.2
Accounting and Quantitative Studies							14		13		1				14	41.8
Finance and Industry							15		14		1				15	44.9
Management and Marketing							18		17		1				18	43.9
Office Administration							7		5		2				6	48.7
School of Education	32	9.1	24	75.0	8	25.0	52	7.9	40	76.9	12	23.1	32	47.4	52	49.3
Advanced Studies							13		13						13	51.0
Secondary Education	6		6				9		9				6	45.8	9	51.9
Elementary Education	25		17		8		18		10		8		25	47.8	18	49.2
Laboratory School	1		1				12		8		4		1	45.0	12	45.8

TABLE 1 (continued)

Schools and Departments	SEX												AGE			
	Fall 63						Fall 68						Fall 63		Fall 68	
	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	%	M	%	F	%	N	Mean Years	N*	Mean Years
School of Engineering	14	4.0	14				15	2.3	15				14	46.4	15	47.9
School of Professional Studies	45	12.9	26	57.8	19	42.2	82	12.5	41	50.0	41	50.0	45	44.1	81	44.4
Criminology	3		3				4		4				3	47.7	4	50.2
Health Science	4		3		1		5		4		1		4	45.5	5	47.2
Home Economics	5				5		18		2		16		5	42.4	18	38.9
Industrial Arts	13		13				21		21				13	46.5	20	45.2
Journalism	4		4				8		8				4	45.8	8	44.1
Nursing	16		3		13		26		2		24		16	41.3	26	46.1
School of Social Work	9	2.6	8	87.5	1	12.5	32	4.9	21	65.6	11	34.4	9	43.8	32	43.2
Totals	350		288	82.3	62	17.7	656		519	79.1	137	20.9	350	43.7	652	43.1
Totals less Administration (but including Librarians) for 1968							614		484	78.8	130	21.2			611	42.6

---

*Discrepancies between numbers for Sex and Age for 1968 exist because complete information on age could not be obtained.

Explanatory Note: In Tables 1, 2, and 3 the total faculty membership is 614, but the total Assembly membership is 656. The extra 42 people are in the administration category of each table and percentages are computed on the larger Assembly membership except as noted.

TABLE 2

Fresno State College Faculty:
Rank by Schools and Departments, Fall 1963 and Fall 1968

Schools and Departments	Fall 1963								Fall 1968									
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Other		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administration	1	14.3	3	42.9	3	42.9			9	21.4	6	14.3	5 (18, 42.9% - n.a.)[2]	11.9	2	4.8	2	4.8
Administrators (with rank)									7		1				2		2	
Administrators (without rank)											1		(14 - n.a.)					
Student Personnel									2		4		5		(3 - n.a.)			
Medical Office													(1 - n.a.)					
Library													(all 28 - n.a.)					
School of Agriculture[1]							22		1	4.0	2	8.0			2	8.0	20	80.0
Agricultural Mechanics							3								1		1	
Animal Science							9		1		1						8	
Plant Science							9				1				1		9	
Farm Manager							1											
School of Arts and Sciences	48	24.6	51	26.2	87	44.6	9	4.6	82	25.2	73	22.4	146	44.8	20	6.1	5	1.5
Anthro-Sociology									3		1		7		1			
Art	1		1		6		1				4		13				1	
Biology	6		6		6				10		7		8					
Chemistry	5		2		5				5		5		5		1			
Economics	2				3				2		2		4		3			
English	2		2		13		1		3		9		14		1		1	
Foreign Languages	3				9				2		10		10					
Geography	1		2		2				5		2		5		2			

TABLE 2 (continued)

Schools and Departments	Fall 1963								Fall 1968									
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Other		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School of Arts and Sciences (Cont.)																		
Geology	2		1		2				2		2		4					
History	2		3		4		2		6		4		13		2		1	
Linguistics									1		1		5					
Mathematics	2		1		8				2		3		8					
Music	7		2		6				7		4		2		2		1	
Philosophy			2		3				3				5					
Physical Education	7		11		2		4		10		6		13		4			
Physics	2		4		1				5				4					
Political Science			2		3				2		4		3		2			
Psychology	3		6		5		1		7		2		7					
Speech-Arts	3		6		9				7		7		16		1		1	
Black Studies															1			
School of Business	8	30.8	7	26.9	11	42.3			17	31.5	12	22.2	22	40.7	3	5.5		
Accounting and Quantitative Studies									4		4		6					
Finance and Industry									5		3		6		1			
Management and Marketing									6		3		8		1			
Office Administration									2		2		2		1			
School of Education	12	37.5	8	25.0	12	37.5			20	38.5	12	23.1	10	19.2				
													(10, 19.2% - n.a.)					
Advanced Studies									7		5		1					
Secondary Education	3		1		2				7		1		1					
Elementary Ecuation	9		6		10				4		6		8					
Laboratory School			1						2				(10 - n.a.)					

TABLE 2 (continued)

Schools and Departments	Fall 1963								Fall 1968									
	Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Other		Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Lecturer		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
School of Engineering	4	28.6	2	14.3	8	57.1			5	35.7	8	57.1	1	7.1			1	7.1
School of Professional Studies	10	22.2	8	17.8	26	57.8	1	2.2	17	20.7	24	29.3	35	42.7	1	1.2	5	6.1
Criminology	1		1		1				2		1		1					
Health Science	2		1		1				4				1					
Home Economics			1		4				1		4		9		1		3	
Industrial Arts	4		4		5				6		8		7					
Journalism	3				1				3		2		3					
Nursing			1		14		1		1		9		14				2	
School of Social Work	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.5			4	12.5	15	46.9	12	37.5	1	3.1		
Totals	86	24.6	81	23.1	151	43.1	32	9.1	155	23.6	152	23.2	231	35.2	29	4.4	33	5.0
											(56, 8.5% - n.a.)							
Totals less Administration (but including Librarians) for 1968									146	23.8	146	23.8	226	36.8	27	4.4	31	5.0
											(38, 6.2% - n.a.)							

---

[1] Of the 33 in the "Other" category in 1968, 22 are Vocational Instructors in the School of Agriculture.

[2] This and subsequent notations "n.a." mean not applicable to this category.

TABLE 3

Fresno State College Faculty:
Highest Degree and Duration of Appointment by Schools and Departments for Fall 1963 and Fall 1968

	HIGHEST DEGREE												DURATION OF APPOINTMENT			
	Fall 1963						Fall 1968						Fall 1963		Fall 1968	
	Bachelor		Master		Doctoral		Bachelor		Master		Doctoral					
Schools and Departments	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Mean Years	N	Mean Years
Administration			4	57.1	3	42.9	7	10.0	36	51.4	27	38.6	7	7.3	42	10.0
Administrators (with rank)							2		3		7				12	9.3
Administrators (without rank)							1		4		10				15	13.5
Student Personnel							1		5		8				14	5.7
Medical Office											1				1	9.0
Library							3		24		1				28	6.1
School of Agriculture	1	4.8	17	89.9	3	14.3	3	12.0	13	52.0	9	36.0	22	11.5	25	10.6
Agricultural Mechanics			3				1		3				3	12.0	4	8.8
Animal Science	1		6		2		1		6		3		9	10.8	10	11.9
Plant Science			7		1		1		4		6		9	11.6	11	10.0
			(one unknown)													
Farm Manager			1										1	15.0		
Schools of Arts and Sciences	9	4.6	64	32.8	122	62.6	16	4.9	115	35.4	194	59.7	195	9.5	326	6.7
Anthro-Sociology									6		6				12	5.6
Art	1		7		1		2		15		1		9	7.6	18	2.9
Biology					18						25		18	9.8	25	8.7
Chemistry	1				11						16		12	8.1	16	7.5
Economics			2		3		1		5		5		5	8.4	11	3.6
English			4		14		1		9		18		18	7.1	28	5.2

TABLE 3 (continued)

Schools and Departments	HIGHEST DEGREE Fall 1963 Bachelor N	%	Master N	%	Doctoral N	%	Fall 1968 Bachelor N	%	Master N	%	Doctoral N	%	DURATION OF APPOINTMENT Fall 1963 N	Mean Years	Fall 1968 N	Mean Years
School of Arts and Sciences (cont.)																
Foreign Languages	1		1		10				6		16		12	8.6	22	6.2
Geography			1		4		1		3		10		5	6.4	14	4.4
Geology	1				4						8		5	10.0	8	7.0
History			4		7		1		10 (one unknown)		14		11	8.4	26	5.8
Linguistics							2		2		3				7	2.4
Mathematics			5		6				4		9		11	5.8	13	5.0
Music			9		6		2		5		9		15	14.6	16	10.3
Philosophy					5		1		2		5		5	6.8	8	4.8
Physical Education	3		19		2		3		24		6		24	13.6	33	10.1
Physics					7						9		7	10.1	9	9.8
Political Science			2		3				3		8		5	9.0	11	5.5
Psychology			2		13						16		15	8.7	16	7.8
Speech-Arts	2		8		8		2		20		10		18	9.8	32	7.2
Black Studies									1						1	0.0
School of Business			9	34.6	17	65.4			22	41.5	31	58.5	26	8.7	54	4.9
Accounting and Quantitative Studies									5		9				14	4.9
Finance and Industry									4		11				15	3.9
Management and Marketing									9		9				18	3.7
Office Administration									4 (one unknown)		2				7	10.3
School of Education			5	15.6	27	84.4	4	7.7	14	26.9	34	65.4	32	8.9	52	8.5
Advanced Studies											13				13	9.1
Secondary Education					6						9		6	8.8	9	13.7

TABLE 3 (continued)

	HIGHEST DEGREE												DURATION OF APPOINTMENT			
	Fall 1963						Fall 1968						Fall 1963		Fall 1968	
	Bachelor		Master		Doctoral		Bachelor		Master		Doctoral			Mean		Mean
Schools and Departments	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	Years	N	Years
School of Education (Cont.)																
Elementary Education			5		20		1		7		10		25	9.1	18	6.9
Laboratory School					1		3		7		2		1	5.0	12	6.6
School of Engineering	2	14.3	10	71.4	2	14.3	1	6.7	12	80.0	2	13.3	14	7.4	15	9.5
School of Professional Studies	5	11.1	27	60.0	13	28.9	9	11.0	58	70.7	15	18.3	45	7.8	82	6.6
Criminology	1		2				1		2		1		3	7.3	4	9.3
Health Science					4				1		4		4	10.0	5	12.2
Home Economics			2		3		4		11		3		5	6.2	18	3.0
Industrial Arts			10		3		1		16		4		13	12.2	21	9.4
Journalism	1				3				5		3		4	13.8	8	12.1
Nursing	3		13				3		23				16	2.6	26	3.7
School of Social Work			3	33.3	6	66.7	1	3.1	25	78.1	6	18.8	9	8.0	32	1.8
Totals	17	4.9	139	39.7	193	55.1	41	6.1	295	45.2	318	48.7	350	9.1	656	6.8
		(one unknown)						(two unknown)								
Totals less Administration (but including Librarians) for 1968							36	5.9	283	46.3	292	47.8			614	6.6

TABLE 4

Committee Composition by Selected Variables

	Sex				Rank								Highest Degree						Age	Duration of Appointment
					Professor		Associate Professor		Assistant Professor		Other		Doctoral		Masters		Bachelor			
Committee	M	%	F	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	Mean Years	Mean Years
The College 1968 (Administration n.a.)	484	78.8	130	21.2	146	25.4	146	25.4	226	39.8	57	10.3	292	47.8	283	46.3	37	5.9	43.1	6.8
AP&P	14	93.3	1	6.7	8	53.3	6	40.0	0		1	6.7	12	80.0	2	13.3	1	6.7	48.8	13.7
BORAP	8	88.9	1	11.1	8	88.9	0		0		1	11.1	7	77.8	2	22.2	0		50.2	13.7
Budget	16	100.0	0		5	31.2	3	18.8	4	25.0	4	25.0	9	56.3	6	37.5	1	6.2	48.1	10.9
Committee on Committees	12	92.3	1	7.7	7	53.9	3	23.0	0		3	23.0	8	61.5	5	38.5	0		46.2	10.6
Consultative Procedures	6	100.0	0		5	83.3	1	16.7	0		0		6	100.0	0		0		45.2	9.6
Executive Committee	19	90.5	2	9.5	13	61.9	5	23.8	0		3	14.3	15	71.4	6	28.6	0		47.0	11.3
Personnel Committee	10	76.9	3	23.1	10	76.9	3	23.1	0		0		10	76.9	3	23.1	0		46.9	13.1
Student Affairs	15	88.2	2	11.8	3	17.7	7	41.2	4	23.5	3	17.7	11	64.7	5	29.4	1	5.9	42.1	7.3
Academic Senate	89	84.8	16	15.2	47	44.8	31	29.5	13	12.4	14	13.3	70	66.7	34	32.4	1	1.0	46.0	10.3

TABLE 5

Membership of Eight Committees and the Academic Senate: by School for the period 1966-67 through 1968-69, counted by individuals

Schools	Academic Senate		AP&P		BORAP		Budget Committee		Committee on Committees		Consultative Procedures		Executive Committee		Personnel Committee		Student Affairs	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Administration	6	5.7					2	12.5	1	7.7			2	9.5	2	15.4	2	11.8
Agriculture	6	5.7	1	6.7	1	11.1	2	12.5	2	15.4			1	4.8			2	11.8
Arts & Sciences	56	53.3	6	40.0	4	44.4	7	43.8	7	53.8	4	66.7	10	47.6	7	53.8	7	41.2
Business	7	6.7	2	13.3	2	22.2	2	12.5	1	7.7	1	16.7	2	9.5	1	7.7		
Education	8	7.6	2	13.3	1	11.1	1	6.3			1	16.7	3	14.3	1	7.7	2	11.8
Engineering	2	1.9			1	11.1	1	6.3										
Professional Studies	16	15.2	2	13.3			1	6.3	2	15.4			3	14.3	2	15.4	3	14.3
Social Work	3	2.9	1	6.7														
Bakersfield Center	1	1.0	1	6.7													1	5.9
Total	105		15		9		16		13		6		21		13		17	

TABLE 6

Committee Service from 1966-67 to 1968-69: Academic Assembly Members, Fall 1968

	Number of Committees						
	0	1	2	3	4	5+	Total
Number of Individuals	417	126	57	33	16	7	656
Percent	63.57	19.21	8.69	5.03	2.44	1.07	

References

Academic Assembly, Fresno State College. Constitution and bylaws.

Academic Senate, Fresno State College. Constitution and bylaws.

Academic Senate, Fresno State College. Minutes of selected Senate and collegewide committees.

Business Manager, Fresno State College. Formulas and guidelines for instructional positions.

Business Manager, Fresno State College. Preparation of the 1968-69 support budget request.

California Administrative Code.

California Education Code.

College Master Plan.

Committee on Academic Reorganization of the College. Report.

Faculty Handbook. Fresno: Fresno State College, August 1968 (mimeographed).

Foster, J. F. S. A political model for the university. Educational Record, Fall 1968, 49, 435-443.

Fresno State College. *Consultative procedures documents*.

Fresno State College. *Interim personnel report*.

Livingston, J. C. The academic senate under fire. In G. K. Smith (Ed.), *Agony and promise*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1969.

Master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975. Sacramento: California State Department of Education, 1960.

Stull, H. C. Faculty reorganization at Western Illinois University. In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.), *The study of academic administration*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, October 1963.

Waldo, D. Roles in university decision making. Paper presented at a study program on Roles in University Decision Making, Syracuse University, June-July 1968. Mimeographed.

Wicke, M. F. Deans: 'Men in the middle.' In T. F. Lunsford (Ed.), *The study of academic administration*. Boulder: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, October 1963.

GPO 978-575